ST

Vincent

PUBLIC EDUCATION.

Price 5s. in boards.

PUBLIC EDUCATION;

CONSISTING OF THREE TRACTS,

REPRINTED FROM

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW;

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

AND THE

PAMPHLETEER;

TOGETHER WITH THE

DEFENCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

BY THE LATE

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

LONDON:

Printed by A. J. Valpy, Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane.

SOLD BY LAW AND CO.; LONGMAN AND CO.; BALDWIN AND CO.; LACKINGTON AND CO.; RIVINGTON, LONDON: BARRET, CAMBRIDGE: MACREDIE AND CO.; EDINBURGH: CUMMING, DUBLIN: AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1817.

PUBLIC EDUCATION;

CONSISTING OF THREE TRACTS,

REPRINTED FROM

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW;

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

AND THE

PAMPHLETEER;

TOGETHER WITH THE

DEFENCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

BY THE LATE

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

LONDON:

Printed by A. J. Valpy, Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane.

SOLD BY LAW AND CO.; LONGMAN AND CO.; BALDWIN AND CO.; LACKINGTON AND CO.; RIVINGTON, LONDON: BARRET, CAMBRIDGE: MACREDIE AND CO.; EDINBURGH: CUMMING, DUBLIN: AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1817.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

&c.

THERE is a set of well-dressed, prosperous gentlemen, who assemble daily at Mr. Hatchard's shop;—clean, civil personages, well in with people in power,—delighted with every existing institution—and almost with every existing circumstance;—and every now and then, one of these personages writes a little book;—and the rest praise that little book—expecting to be praised, in their turn, for their own little books:—and, of these little books, thus written by these clean, civil personages, so expecting to be praised, the pamphlet before us appears to be one.

The subject of it is the advantage of public schools; and the author, very creditably to himself, ridicules the absurd clamour, first set on foot by Dr. Rennel, of the irreligious ten-

dency of public schools: he then proceeds to an investigation of the effects which public schools may produce upon the moral character; and here the subject becomes more difficult, and the pamphlet worse.

In arguing any large or general question, it is of infinite importance to attend to the first feelings which the mention of the topic has a tendency to excite; and the name of a public school brings with it immediately the idea of brilliant classical attainments: but, upon the importance of these studies, we are not now offering any opinion. The only points for consideration are, whether boys are put in the way of becoming good and wise men by these schools; and whether they actually gather, there, those attainments which it pleases mankind, for the time being, to consider as valuable, and to decorate by the name of learning.

By a public school, we mean an endowed place of education, of old standing, to which the sons of gentlemen resort in considerable numbers, and where they continue to reside,

from eight or nine, to eighteen years of age. We do not give this as a definition which would have satisfied Porphyry or Duns-Scotus, but as one sufficiently accurate for our purpose. The characteristic features of these schools are, their antiquity, the numbers, and the ages of the young people who are educated at them. We beg leave, however, to premise, that we have not the slightest intention of insinuating any thing to the disparagement of the present discipline or present rulers of these schools, as compared with other times and other men: we have no reason whatever to doubt that they are as ably governed at this, as they have been at any preceding period. Whatever objections we may have to these institutions, they are to faults, not depending upon present administration, but upon original construction.

At a public school (for such is the system established by immemorial custom), every boy is alternately tyrant and slave. The power which the elder part of these communities ex-

ercises over the younger, is exceedingly great —very difficult to be controled—and accompanied, not unfrequently, with cruelty and caprice. It is the common law of the place, that the young should be implicitly obedient to the elder boys; and this obedience resembles more the submission of a slave to his master, or of a sailor to his captain, than the common and natural deference which would always be shown by one boy to another a few years older than himself. Now, this system we cannot help considering as an evil,—because it inflicts upon boys, for two or three years of their lives, many painful hardships, and much unpleasant servitude. These sufferings might perhaps be of some use in military schools; but, to give to a boy the habit of enduring privations to which he will never again be called upon to submit—to inure him to pains which he will never again feel—and to subject him to the privation of comforts, with which he will always in future abound—is surely not a very useful and valuable sever-

ity in education. It is not the life in miniature which he is to lead hereafter—nor does it bear any relation to it:—he will never again be subjected to so much insolence and caprice; nor ever, in all human probability, called upon to make so many sacrifices. The servile obedience which it teaches, might be useful to a menial domestic; or the habits of enterprise which it encourages, prove of importance to a military partisan; but we cannot see what bearing it has upon the calm, regular, civil life, which the sons of gentlemen, destined to opulent idleness, or to any of the three learned professions, are destined to lead. Such a system makes many boys very miserable; and produces those bad effects upon the temper and disposition, which unjust suffering always does produce;—but what good it does, we are much at a loss to conceive. Reasonable obedience is extremely useful in forming the disposition. Submission to tyranny lays the foundation of hatred, suspicion, cunning, and a variety of odious passions. We are convinced

that those young people will turn out to be the best men, who have been guarded most effectually, in their childhood, from every species of useless vexation; and experienced, in the greatest degree, the blessings of a wise and rational indulgence. But even if these effects upon future character are not produced, still, four or five years in childhood make a very considerable period of human existence; and it is by no means a trifling consideration whether they are passed happily or unhappily. The wretchedness of school tyranny is trifling enough to a man who only contemplates it, in ease of body and tranquillity of mind, through the medium of twenty intervening years; but it is quite as real, and quite as acute, while it lasts, as any of the sufferings of mature life; and the utility of these sufferings, or the price paid in compensation for them, should be clearly made out to a conscientious parent, before he consents to expose his children to them.

This system also gives to the elder boys an

absurd and pernicious opinion of their own importance, which is often with difficulty effaced by a considerable commerce with the world. The *head* of a public school is generally a very conceited young man, utterly ignorant of his own dimensions, and losing all that habit of conciliation towards others, and that anxiety for self-improvement, which result from the natural modesty of youth. Nor is this conceit very easily and speedily gotten rid of;—we have seen (if we mistake not) public school importance lasting through the half of after life, strutting in lawn, swelling in ermine, and displaying itself, both ridiculously and offensively, in the haunts and business of bearded men.

There is a manliness in the athletic exercises of public schools, which is as seductive to the imagination as it is utterly unimportant in itself. Of what importance is it in after life, whether a boy can play well or ill at cricket; or row a boat with the skill and precision of a waterman? If our young lords and

esquires were hereafter to wrestle together in public, or the gentlemen of the Bar to exhibit Olympic games in Hilary Term, the glory attached to these exercises at public schools would be rational and important. But of what use is the body of an athlete, when we have good laws over our heads,—or when a pistol, a post-chaise, or a porter can be hired for a few shillings? A gentleman does nothing but ride or walk; and yet such a ridiculous stress is laid upon the manliness of the exercises customary at public schools—exercises in which the greatest blockheads commonly excel the most—as often render habits of idleness inveterate—and often lead to foolish expense and dissipation at a more advanced period of life.

One of the supposed advantages of a public school, is the greater knowledge of the world which a boy is considered to derive from those situations; but if, by a knowledge of the world, is meant a knowledge of the forms and manners which are found to be the most pleas-

ing and useful in the world, a boy from a public school is almost always extremely deficient in these particulars; and his sister, who has remained at home at the apron-strings of her mother, is very much his superior in the science of manners. It is probably true, that a boy at a public school has made more observations on human character, because he has had more opportunities of observing, than have been enjoyed by young persons educated either at home or at private schools: but this little advantage gained at a public school, is so soon overtaken at college or in the world, that, to have made it, is of the least possible consequence, and utterly undeserving of any risk incurred in the acquisition. Is it any injury to a man of thirty or thirty-five years of age—to a learned serjeant or a venerable dean—that at eighteen they did not know so much of the world as some other boys of the same standing? They have probably escaped the arrogant character so often attendant upon this trifling superiority; nor is there much chance that they

have ever fallen into the common and youthful error of mistaking a premature initiation into vice, for a knowledge of the ways of mankind: and, in addition to these salutary exemptions, a winter in London brings it all to a level; and offers to every novice the advantages which are supposed to be derived from this precocity of confidence and polish.

According to the general prejudice in favour of public schools, it would be thought quite as absurd and superfluous to enumerate the illustrious characters who have been bred at our three great seminaries of this description, as it would be to descant upon the illustrious characters who have passed in and out of London over our three great bridges. Almost every conspicuous person is supposed to have been educated at public schools; and there are scarcely any means (as it is imagined) of making an actual comparison; and yet, great as the rage is, and long has been, for public schools, it is very remarkable, that the most eminent men in every art and science have not

been educated in public schools; and this is true, even if we include, in the term of public schools, not only Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, but the Charter-House, St. Paul's school, Merchant Taylors, Rugby, and every school in England, at all conducted upon the plan of the three first. The great schools of Scotland we do not call public schools, because in these, the mixture of domestic life gives to them a widely different character. Spenser, Pope, Shakspere, Butler, Rochester, Spratt, Parnell, Garth, Congreve, Gay, Swift, Thomson, Shenstone, Akenside, Goldsmith, Samuel Johnson, Beaumont and Fletcher, Ben Jonson, Sir Philip Sidney, Savage, Arbuthnot, and Burns, among the poets, were not educated in the system of English schools. Sir Isaac Newton, Maclaurin, Wallis, Hamstead, Saunderson, Simpson, and Napier, among men of science, were not educated in public schools. The three best historians that the English language has produced, Clarendon, Hume, and Robertson, were not educated

at public schools. Public schools have done little in England for the fine arts—as in the examples of Inigo Jones, Vanbrugh, Reynolds, Gainsborough, Garrick, &c. The great medical writers and discoverers in Great Britain, Harvey, Cheselden, Hunter, Jenner, Meade, Brown, and Cullen, were not educated at public schools. Of the great writers on morals and metaphysics, it was not the system of public schools which produced Bacon, Shaftesbury, Hobbes, Berkley, Butler, Hume, Hartley, or Dugald Stewart. The greatest discoverers in chemistry have not been brought up at public schools;—we mean Dr. Priestley, Dr. Black, and Mr. Davy. The only Englishmen who have evinced a remarkable genius, in modern times, for the art of war,—the Duke of Marlborough, Lord Peterborough, General Wolfe, and Lord Clive, were all trained in private schools. So were Lord Coke, Sir Mathew Hale, and Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, and Chief Justice Holt, among the lawyers. So also, among statesmen, were

Lord Burleigh, Walsingham, the Earl of Strafford, Thurloe, Cromwell, Hampden, Lord Clarendon, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sydney, Russell, Sir W. Temple, Lord Somers, Burke, Pitt. In addition to this list, we must not forget the names of such eminent scholars and men of letters, as Cudworth, Chillingworth, Tillotson, Archbishop King, Selden, Conyers Middleton, Bentley, Sir Thomas More, Cardinal Wolsey, Bishops Sherlock and Wilkins, Jeremy Taylor, Isaac Hooker, Bishops Usher, Stillingfleet, and Spelman, Dr. Samuel Clark, Bishop Hoadley, and Dr. Lardner. Nor must it be forgotten, in this examination, that none of the conspicuous writers upon political economy which this country has as yet produced, have been brought up in public schools. If it be urged that public schools have only assumed their present character within this last century, or half century, and that what are now called public schools, partook, before this period, of the nature of private schools, there must then

be added to our lists, the names of Milton, Dryden, Addison, &c. &c.; and it will follow, that the English have done almost all that they have done in the arts and sciences, without the aid of that system of education to which they are now so much attached. Ample as this catalogue of celebrated names already is, it would be easy to double it: yet, as it stands, it is obviously sufficient to show that great eminence may be attained in any line of fame, without the aid of public schools. Some more striking inferences might perhaps be drawn from it; but we content ourselves with the simple fact.

The most important peculiarity in the constitution of a public school is its numbers, which are so great, that a close inspection of the Master into the studies and conduct of each individual is quite impossible. We must be allowed to doubt, whether such an arrangement is favourable either to literature or morals.

Upon this system, a boy is left almost en-

tirely to himself, to impress upon his own mind, as well as he can, the distant advantages of knowledge, and to withstand, from his own innate resolution, the examples and the seductions of idleness. A firm character survives this brave neglect; and very exalted talents may sometimes remedy it by subsequent diligence: But schools are not made for a few youths of pre-eminent talents, and strong characters; such prizes can, of course, be drawn but by a very few parents. The best school is that which is best accommodated to the greatest variety of characters, and which embraces the greatest number of cases. It cannot be the main object of education to render the splendid more splendid, and to lavish care upon those who would almost thrive without any care at all. A public school does this effectually; but it commonly leaves the idle almost as idle, and the dull almost as dull, as it found them. It disdains the tedious cultivation of those middling talents, of which only the great mass of human beings are pos-

sessed. When a strong desire of improvement exists, it is encouraged, but no pains are taken to inspire it. A boy is cast in among five or six hundred other boys, and is left to form his own character;—if his love of knowledge survives this severe trial, it, in general, carries him very far: And, upon the same principle, a savage, who grows up to manhood, is, in general, well made, and free from all bodily defects; not because the severities of such a state are favourable to animal life, but because they are so much the reverse, that none but the strongest can survive them. A few boys are incorrigibly idle, and a few incorrigibly eager for knowledge; but the great mass are in a state of doubt and fluctuation; and they come to school for the express purpose, not of being left to themselves—for that could be done anywhere—but that their wavering tastes and propensities should be decided by the intervention of a master. In a forest, or public school for oaks and elms, the trees are left to themselves; the strong plants live, and the

weak ones die: the towering oak that remains is admired; the saplings that perish around it are cast into the flames and forgotten. But it is not surely to the vegetable struggle of a forest, or the hasty glance of a forester, that a botanist would commit a favourite plant: he would naturally seek for it a situation of less hazard, and a cultivator whose limited occupations would enable him to give to it a reasonable share of his time and attention. The very meaning of education seems to us to be, that the old should teach the young, and the wise direct the weak; that a man who professes to instruct, should get among his pupils, study their characters, gain their affections, and form their inclinations and aversions. In a public school, the numbers render this impossible; it is impossible that sufficient time should be found for this useful and affectionate interference. Boys, therefore, are left to their own crude conceptions, and ill-formed propensities; and this neglect is called a spirited and manly education.

In by far the greatest number of cases, we cannot think public schools favourable to the cultivation of knowledge; and we have equally strong doubts if they be so to the cultivation of morals,—though we admit, that, upon this point, the most striking arguments have been produced in their favour.

It is contended by the friends to public schools, that every person, before he comes to man's estate, must run through a certain career of dissipation; and that if that career is, by the means of a private education, deferred to a more advanced period of life, it will only be begun with greater eagerness, and pursued into more blameable excess. The time must, of course, come, when every man must be his own master; when his conduct can be no longer regulated by the watchful superintendance of another, but must be guided by his own discretion. Emancipation must come at last; and we admit, that the object to be aimed at is, that such emancipation should be gradual, and not premature.

Upon this very invidious point of the discussion, we rather wish to avoid offering any opinion. The manners of great schools vary considerably from time to time; and what may have been true many years ago, is very possibly not true at the present period. In this instance, every parent must be governed by his own observations and means of information. If the license which prevails at public schools is only a fair increase of liberty, proportionate to advancing age, and calculated to prevent the bad effects of a sudden transition from tutelary thraldom to perfect self-government, it is certainly a good, rather than an evil. If, on the contrary, there exists in these places of education a system of premature debauchery, and if they only prevent men from being corrupted by the world, by corrupting them before their entry into the world, they can then only be looked upon as evils of the greatest magnitude, however they may be sanctioned by opinion, or rendered familiar to us by habit.

The vital and essential part of a school, is the master; but, at a public school, no boy, or, at the best, only a very few, can see enough of him to derive any considerable benefit from his character, manners, and information. It is certainly of eminent use, particularly to a young man of rank, that he should have lived among boys; but it is only so, when they are all moderately watched by some superior understanding. The morality of boys is generally very imperfect; their notions of honour extremely mistaken; and their objects of ambition frequently very absurd. The probability then is, that the kind of discipline they exercise over each other, will produce (when left to itself) a great deal of mischief; and yet this is the discipline to which every child at a public school is not only necessarily exposed, but principally confined. Our objection (we again repeat) is not to the interference of boys in the formation of the character of boys; their character, we are persuaded, will be very imperfectly formed without their assistance: but

our objection is to that almost exclusive agency which they exercise in public schools.

After having said so much in opposition to the general prejudice in favour of public schools, we may be expected to state what species of school we think preferable to them; for if public schools, with all their disadvantages, are the best that can actually be found, or easily attained, the objections to them are certainly made to very little purpose.

We have no hesitation, however, in saying, that that education seems to us to be the best, which mingles a domestic with a school life; and which gives to a youth the advantage which is to be derived from the learning of a master, and the emulation which results from the society of other boys, together with the affectionate vigilance which he must experience in the house of his parents. But where this species of education, from peculiarity of circumstances or situation, is not attainable, we are disposed to think a society of twenty or thirty boys, under the guidance of a learned

man, and, above all, of a man of good sense, to be a seminary the best adapted for the education of youth. The numbers are sufficient to excite a considerable degree of emulation, to give to a boy some insight into the diversities of the human character, and to subject him to the observation and controul of his superiors. It by no means follows, that a judicious man should always interfere with his authority and advice, because he has always the means; he may connive at many things which he cannot approve, and suffer some little failures to proceed to a certain extent, which, if indulged in wider limits, would be attended with irretrievable mischief. He will be aware, that his object is to fit his pupil for the world; that constant controul is a very bad preparation for complete emancipation from all controul; that it is not bad policy to expose a young man, under the eye of superior wisdom, to some of those dangers which will assail him hereafter in greater number, and in greater strength—when he has only his own

resources to depend upon. A private education, conducted upon these principles, is not calculated to gratify quickly the vanity of a parent who is blest with a child of strong character and pre-eminent abilities: to be the first scholar of an obscure master, at an obscure place, is no very splendid distinction; nor does it afford that opportunity, of which so many parents are desirous, of forming great connexions for their children: but if the object be, to induce the young to love knowledge and virtue, we are inclined to suspect, that, for the average of human talents and characters, these are the situations in which such tastes will be the most effectually formed.

ON

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

FROM THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

When I observed in a popular periodical work, an attack on Public Schools, authoritative in its style, illiberal in its spirit, inconclusive in its argument, and incorrect in its statements, I expected to see in some publications of opposite principles a regular confutation of it. Their silence I construed into a general conviction that the attack would be a *telum imbelle;* that the envy and love of detraction, which aimed the blow, would be so obvious as to render it harmless. My conversation with literary characters tended to confirm that construction. But when I considered the extensive range of that publication, and the merit which distinguishes many of its

articles, it appeared probable that the greater number of its readers would not stoop to detect sophisms, or to unravel the clue of the maze of misrepresentation; I thought it therefore expedient that some notice should be taken of this article, that neither apparent indifference nor real contempt might be mistaken for general acquiescence. As a Classical work, like yours, cannot be contaminated by party principles; and as you have shown your impartiality by admitting different views of University education, I have chosen the Classical Journal as a vehicle peculiarly appropriated to this disquisition. It will not be necessary to follow the writer through all the windings and doublings of his course; if he can once be driven from his strongest stations of attack, he will be easily dislodged from the rest, and be left without a substantial ground of defence.

Before I enter more particularly into the subject, I shall say a few words on the curious and novel mode of critical investigation,

in the article under review, and in many other parts of that publication, employed with some success. The dissertation on a subject so important as the comparative merits of different modes of education, begins thus:

"There is a set of well-dressed gentlemen, who assemble daily at Mr. Hatchard's shop!" We are told, moreover, that "these personages are *clean* and *civil*;" an observation not only conducive to illustrate the question, but highly worthy of such[1] "Swains," as Churchill describes one, of whom he thus deftly singeth:

SAWNEY.

"Oh she was bonny; all the Highlands round
Was there a rival to my Maggie found:
More precious, tho' *that precious* be to *all*,
Than that rare medicine, which we brimstone call."[2]

We should imagine the author, by dwelling with so much apparent satisfaction on the word *clean*, to be newly arrived from a certain city

[1] An apology ought to be made for such language to every one, except to a writer in a *Review* so remarkable for insulting personalities.

[2] Churchill's Prophecy of Famine.

renowned for cleanliness and *fragrance*, as it would be difficult to step into any bookseller's shop in the metropolis without meeting persons equally *clean* and civil.

To proceed. "These *clean*, *civil* personages are well in with people in power, delighted with every existing institution," &c. and further, "every now and then, one of these personages writes a little book, and the rest praise that little book, expecting to be praised, in their turn, for their own little books." Now, I will be contented to be thought such a person, and the writer of such a book; and,—without pausing to note the accuracy or elegance of a description, equally entertaining and edifying, as the criticism on the sermon of an illustrious scholar and divine, which began with a diatribe on his wig,—I should think myself deficient in that *civility* so courteously attributed to me, in common with the gentlemen who frequent Mr. H.'s shop, if I did not, *vestibulum ante ipsum primoque in limine*, make my bow, like Beau Nash, and thus endeavour to return the compliment.

There is a set of thriving critics, who frequently assemble at H——d house. These thriving critics having become what Speed calls "assiduous trencher-worms," at the tables of the great, are also become very *clean* and very *civil*,—except to those, from whom they can get nothing, such as English poets and English parsons. These critics are *well in* with people, who, if they are not in power at present, hope be to so soon. They therefore are not at this time particularly delighted with any *existing institution*, or any *existing circumstance*; but doubtless they will be so, when things are altered to their wish. *Every now and then* one of these personages writes an article in a certain "Review," not so much considering *what* is reviewed, as *who*; and through the same channel,—transcribing only a title page, and without perhaps saying a word about the book, except that the author, of whom he knows nothing, is a *good* or *bad* sort of a man,[1]

[1] This was literally the case in the review of Mr. BROADHURST *On Education*.

takes an opportunity to illumine the world with speculations on important subjects, moral, political and critical. The "existing *institutions*" with which these writers are *least delighted*, are the institutions of English education, which they take every occasion to decry: and when one of them has written something very clever, and very severe against these obsolete establishments, in a neat, comprehensive, *little* article, the rest praise that *little* article, expecting to be praised, in their turn, for their own *little* articles. Of these articles, so written by these critical, and sometimes *uncivil*, personages, the article before us appears to be one.

Having thus endeavoured to set the account even, with respect to the velitations of preliminary courtesy, (to emulate the language of my adversary) and soliciting the forgiveness of the serious reader for this parody of such notable criticism, I come to the point, which is the object of discussion, and to which I now beg his attention.

The essential points, on which the critic and myself join issue, are these:

"Whether boys," to use his own statement, "are put in the way of becoming *good* and *wise* men by Public Schools; and whether they actually gather, *there*, those attainments which it pleases mankind, for the time being, to consider as valuable, and to decorate by the name of learning."

When a writer takes the side of the argument, which is adverse to his real opinion, or when he means to exercise the credulity or the risibility of his reader, he generally adopts a certain quaintness of style very different from the ordinary modes of polished diction. On these principles we may almost suspect that our author means to ridicule the cause, which he appears to defend; else he would scarcely suffer such low and vulgar expressions as "to be well in with," "to be put in the way of," and others, to drop from his pen. But as I mean to be serious myself, I shall venture to conclude that he does not mean to amuse

himself at the expense of the partiality of his readers.

My object is not to enter into all the arguments that may be adduced for, or against, the system of public schools, but merely to expose the flippancy, the futility, and, I must add, in some instances, the strange ignorance of a writer, to whose opinions, and to whose decision, many might be disposed to look up, on account of the vehicle in which they are conveyed to the public. At the same time, I trust that some additional light will be thrown on a subject so important to the nation in general, and to parents in particular.

Although we must necessarily keep in mind the question proposed for our examination, a few words must be said in answer to some objections of the reviewer in the outset. The first is, that "at a public school every boy is alternately tyrant and slave." By the account of this writer, one might be led to suppose that the tyranny exercised by the seniors over the juniors at a public school, was something

like that, which is exercised in a slave ship; except that the slaves never become the tyrants. I have heard many mamas make such observations, and inveigh with pathetic expressions that would move a heart of stone, against "that villainous birch," with which the obstreperous stripling is occasionally disciplined. But that a serious investigator, and a "learned Theban," should open his battery against our schools by such trite, and (to use a favorite expression) *anile* objections, is altogether unaccountable. If such "pangs and fears" were really endured, is there one father, who could send a beloved child to the same place of mortification and misery, where he himself knew, from his own experience, what the poor boy was doomed to encounter? On the contrary, there is scarcely a father, who has received his own education in one of those schools, who does not send his son to the same school, without the least apprehension of that formidable train of sufferings. But even if the exaggerated statement were true, it does not apply to

public schools exclusively; and the circumstance just mentioned is superior to a thousand arguments, advanced by those, whose gloomy prejudices exclude the light of knowledge. I shall therefore hasten to other points, leaving the discussion of this to those who have thought religion endangered in our public schools, because Ovid and Homer are introduced in the course of a Latin and Greek education.

We proceed to the next objection of the critic. We are gravely told that "the system gives to the elder boys an absurd and pernicious opinion of their own importance."—"The head of a public school," meaning the head *boy*, not the master, I presume, "is generally very *conceited*, utterly *ignorant* of his own *dimensions*; nor is *this conceit very easily and speedily gotten* rid of.[1] We have seen,"

[1] *Gotten rid of!* The swelling importance of that uncouth participle is equalled only by the grovelling lowness of the final preposition. Is this English, is this Scotch idiom? Is this the language of Johnson or Gibbon, of Ferguson or Robertson?

add these admirable judges of nature, of society, and of language, "*(if we mistake not)* public school importance lasting through the half of after life, strutting in lawn, swelling in ermine, and displaying itself, both ridiculously and offensively, in the haunts and business of bearded men."—Indeed! have you *seen* all this? If so, the description must mean to designate some particular public character. The Bench of Bishops, "if I mistake not," were chiefly educated in Public Schools; and their characters are as remote from this description as light from darkness. Are a Bathurst, a Burgess, and a Huntingford, for instance, to be so described? [1] I can indeed suppose that the superficial writer of this article, wrapt up in that conceit which is infinitely more apt to be engendered and nourished by a private than by a

[1] To these may be added the newly appointed Bishop of London, educated at the same school, Winchester, and distinguished for modesty and learning, for unassuming suavity of manners, and whatever can adorn the scholar, the gentleman, and the Christian.

public education, might probably have met some Reverend Lord or Venerable Judge, who, from a natural dislike of conceit and pertness, combined with ignorance, did not pay such a deference to his sapience, as he might think a writer in a certain Review ought to receive.

The accusation of "*ignorance of themselves*" against the senior boys of a school is so far from being true, that the very reverse of the proposition is the truth; and indeed affords a strong argument in favor of public education, —that boys so educated *do know*, and *must* know, from longer and more extensive comparison, "their own dimensions." Let them excel ever so much, they see others pressing close; they feel the principle for ever impelling them on, of αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν. Emulation is the parent of every generous and beneficial pursuit, and is no-where in such activity as in a Public School. That system of instruction has a constant tendency to annihilate the self-sufficiency, the egotism and conceit, which are

invariably the consequence of a want of comparison. In a small circle, where no collision can smooth the rough-edges of a peevish or an illiberal disposition, the evils, of which the Reviewer complains, are oftener found than in a large society. Of this many instances will be placed in a strong light, when I come to the consideration of some of those illustrious names, which the Critic has enumerated. In the mean time I shall add, that,—as my "ipse vidi" (if that be thought an argument) is at least as good as his—we also have seen (*if we mistake not*) many a youth taken from a public school by the entreaties of his mama, fostered among those by whom he was never contradicted, learning all the meannesses of low life, with all the importance of assumed superiority, becoming the Tony Lumpkin of the Three Pigeons, in his youth; and in age, the sullen and solitary despot of his village, because he could brook no superior, disgusted his equals, and disdained his inferiors.[1]

[1] The author of this notable piece of criticism is un-

In such schools as the critic recommends, the evils, which form the subject of his objections, will not be removed. Among twenty boys, three or four will obtain a superiority, either of mind or body, and become what he is pleased to call tyrants. Even of three brothers in a family, the eldest will command the services of his juniors. I remember to have met the pupils of a small private school in their holyday walk. One of the seniors, finding himself warm, imposed the load of his coat on the back of a junior. One of the "civil personages, well in" with the reviewer and his friends, passing by, expostulated with the former on his violation of the rule of right, and of the fitness of things. "Ah, Sir," said the boy readily and coolly, "in spite of levelling doctrines and jacobinical principles, there

derstood "if we mistake not," to have been himself educated at a public school; and at Oxford: a circumstance itself stronger and much stronger than any thing he has advanced, against such a mode of education! Ten such writers would do more to discredit those seminaries than ten thousand such articles!

is no such thing as equality among mankind."

A third objection is made to what has been said in recommendation of Public Schools, with regard to the "*manly exercises*," which are encouraged in them. We expected some anti recreation remarks; but any thing so absurd as those before us we really did not expect. Let the reader attend to the following admirable specimen of reasoning:

"If our young lords and esquires were hereafter to *wrestle* together in public, or the gentlemen at the bar to exhibit *Olympic games* in *Hilary Term*, the glory attached to these exercises at public schools would be rational and important. But of what use is the body of an athlete, when we have good laws over our heads?"—Reader, have you passed through any school of rational education; are you now, perhaps, in the first form in one of our celebrated places of instruction; have you ever been punished for a bad exercise? Now then tell us, what does such a writer, obtruding himself "in the haunts of bearded men,"

deserve?—However, let us go on with this objection. "Of what importance," it is asked, "is it in after-life, whether a boy can play well or ill at cricket, or row a boat, &c.?" Of the present *glory*, or of the future *importance*, I have never heard much advanced; but I have no hesitation to say that those exercises are both *rational and important*; and that, for the best of all possible reasons, as being conducive, at this time of life, to health, to activity of mind, as well as body. So thought Milton—so thought Locke; and so thinks every man of common sense. In this point of view, therefore, such exercises are not only innocent, but rational and important, as preventing that stagnation of mind, which dwindles a young man into a pale and plodding dolt. But the absurdity of the reviewer's opinion reaches its utmost climax, when we are gravely informed that it is useless for a boy *to play at cricket*, because when he is a man, he can *go to law!* Are these the judges to whom our publications are to be submitted?

are these to adopt the maxim of Publius Syrus, "Judex damnatur, cum nocens absolvitur?"—One would suppose that the writer conceived the son of an English nobleman or gentleman was to be bred up in such a manner as to be allowed to take no delight but in looking over a ledger, or that he was destined to become a sedentary lecturer or professor, with his best hat brushed, and his long cravat plaited once a week;—or, as unlike as possible to the *clean, civil* gentlemen in Mr. H.'s shop, to resemble in appearance and physiognomy the portrait of Mr. Thomas Dilworth over a deal desk, never separated from a penknife and pounce-box.

If I have wandered so far from the material points to be considered, I must lay it to the charge of the reviewer, whose steps for a little way I have thought myself bound to follow, in making these remarks on the futility of his principal objections.

The course of argument has now brought me to the strongest and most material test.

The criterion proposed is summary and decisive. An illustrious army of poets, philosophers, chemists, painters, historians, general scholars, warriors and statesmen, &c. are all drawn up in array against the education produced by public schools; the whole is brought forward to prove that if such men are produced without "that system of education, to which the English are so much attached," the inference is obvious. Although we do not send our noble youths to Westminster to become poets and philosophers, we need not shrink from this challenge. By their fruits we shall know them. It will be therefore necessary to examine the lists more attentively; for like an Asiatic army, that at first appears formidable in numbers and in distant splendor, they, on a closer examination, seem almost to sink into nothing.

One general observation, however, must be made,—that in the illustrious catalogue before us, the whole field, (in the sportsman's phrase) including Ireland and Scotland, is staked

against a part; and it would be a wonderful testimony, indeed, in favor of a few schools, if in the whole educated population,—that is, probably, as ten thousand to one, there were no great and wise men, except those produced by a few particular schools. The reader therefore will bear in mind, not how many great and wise men were produced without the system of our public schools; but in what proportion, taking into consideration the extent of a cultivated and educated population,—these schools have furnished their quota; and whether, side by side, and rank by rank, they are not still masters of the field. If it should appear that they have furnished great and wise men, not only bearing a proportion, but equal, if not superior, to the great catalogue of illustrious worthies opposed to them, it would go near to decide the question between the reviewer and myself.

Before I proceed to examine the catalogue, I must bring before the reader's recollection the very sweeping assertion of the critic. "It

is very remarkable," says he, "that the most eminent men in every art and science have not been educated in public schools; and this is true, even if we include, in the term of public schools, not only Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, but the Charter-House, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Rugby, and every school in England, at all conducted upon the plan of the three first." Now if we avail ourselves of the critic's admission, we shall find that nine out of ten in his catalogue have really been educated in one of those schools, which are denominated *public foundation* schools, conducted on the plan of the three great collegiate schools, in opposition to *private* seminaries, which, however respectable and meritorious, are arbitrarily established without certificate, recommendation, or election. Thus the ground will crumble under his feet, and leave him without even the plausibility of argument. But on the other hand he takes a position, which appears untenantable. "The great schools of Scotland," says he, "we do

not call public schools; because in these the mixture of domestic life, gives to them a widely different character." But the young men educated at the High school, in Edinburgh, and who board in the city, have no more of the "mixture of domestic life," than those who board with the dames at Eton; they, therefore, cannot be said to belong to the class of private instruction. On the same principle, the critic will exclude from public education all the illustrious characters on the continent, who are brought up in the vast and magnificent colleges, which partake of the nature both of school and university, because they are obliged to board in private families. In the outset of a dispute, it is highly expedient to come to a right understanding on the definition of terms; and the reader will probably think that our antagonist has not been remarkably happy in this particular. We will not, however, weigh him too scrupulously in the balance of consistency, or take a strict advantage of the concessions which he has undesignedly made; but proceed to reconnoitre the host, set in array against us.

The first are the Poets; and truly commanding, with the exception of a few weak auxiliaries, the array appears. We have the great leaders, Shakspeare, Spenser, Ben Jonson (we may as well give the proper spelling to his name). After these come what may be called the captains, Beaumont and Fletcher, Butler, Pope, Swift, Akenside, Goldsmith. Then come the lighter troops, headed by Rochester and Congreve; and lastly, the desultory force, consisting of Sprat, Parnell, Garth, Gay, Shenstone, Samuel Johnson, (who appears among them like Cato at a comedy) Sir Philip Sidney, Savage, Arbuthnot, Thomson, and Burns; to which list, that a Scotchman may have fair play, I will add the name, and a truly respectable one, of Beattie; and request also that neither Ramsay nor Drummond (superior to many mentioned) should be omitted.

On this list I shall make a few observations, some incidental, and some very important. I shall then compare with this catalogue the list

furnished from three or four only of our principal schools.

Perhaps I might justly challenge Sprat and Sir Philip Sidney, who are at least of doubtful fame as poets. Few people read Sprat, and fewer still Sir P. Sidney's Sapphics or Heroics. There is also one name admitted to swell the ranks, which is a mere automaton; I mean Arbuthnot, unless, perhaps, the reviewer meant *Armstrong*.

First stands alone, and without a rival, the mighty Shakspeare. We must, indeed, instantly admit, that, could any system of education by its intrinsic effects produce a character, as far as genius is concerned, so transcendent and astonishing, that mode would be undoubtedly unrivalled. But who does not perceive that Shakspeare can be no example in this question? He was a being of his own order, a being, to whom nothing analogous appears in the history of the faculties of man. "Within his circle none durst walk but he." Before a being of this order, all systems of education

shrink; they are the toil and the work of man; Shakspeare was the work of nature; so truly, in respect to him, may we say, "poeta nascitur, non fit." Education, therefore, might, more than any circumstances of fortune, be called, in him, "the drop upon the lion's mane." Yet we must not so blindly worship the god of our idolatry, as to consider him as faultless; we may even venture to assert that, had he received a public classical, and general education, he would have exhibited the perfection of the art of poetry, the union of taste, judgment, and correctness, with the strength of genius, and the fire of imagination.

The case is directly the reverse with another most eminent character, placed against Public Schools,—Ben Jonson. In opposition to Shakspeare, he stands, I confess, the most consummate proof of the force of education. In native gifts he was, no doubt, far below Shakspeare; but education and learning seem in him to run the race with genius, and unite to exhibit to after-ages one of the most striking

instances of their effects. In point of poetical imagery and wildness of fancy, let the reader compare, with this view, the songs of the witches in Jonson's Mask, and then in Shakspeare's Macbeth. Ben Jonson, therefore, but not Shakspeare, would appear to be a splendid example, as far as poetry is concerned, against Public Schools. I am inclined, however, to suspect that the reviewer is not very intimately acquainted with the works of this distinguished writer: I will therefore beg the reviewer's attention to the following "Epigram," as it is called.

TO WILLIAM CAMDEN.

Camden, most reverend head, to whom I owe
All that I am *in arts*, all that *I know*,
(How nothing's that!) to whom my country owes
The great renown, and name wherewith she goes:
Than Thee the age sees not that thing more grave,
More high, more holy, that she more would crave.
What name, what skill, what faith, hast thou in things,
What sight in searching the most antique springs!
What weight, and what authority in speech!
More scarce can make that doubt, but thou canst teach.

Pardon free truth, and let thy modesty,
Which conquers all, be once o'ercome by Thee.
Many of thine this better could than I :
But for *their powers*, accept *my piety !*

Now as the critic may know as little of this William Camden as he seems to do of Ben Jonson, it may be proper to acquaint him that this WILLIAM CAMDEN was the author of a book called "Britannia," of "Remains concerning Britain," and of "Annals of Queen Elizabeth;" and that, moreover, HE WAS HEAD MASTER OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL: under whom, at that same school, was educated THIS IDENTICAL BEN JONSON ! It is probable that the critic may not have read so much of Ben Jonson as to have seen this "Epigram;" yet had he but opened the first page, the following remarkable and decisive words would have stared him in the face, in the dedication to Camden : "I am none of those, who can suffer the benefits conferred upon my youth to perish with my age—I pray you to accept this, such, wherein neither the confession of my manners

shall make you blush, nor of my studies repent you to have been the *instructor*."

Who will not be astonished at such ignorance, such impudent ignorance! The writer has committed himself in this instance, as in others, by an inaccuracy, the more unpardonable, since Ben Jonson is himself precisely such a character, as in estimating the comparative merit of schools, so far as his own art and learning are concerned, would turn the scale.

Having thus taken one of your guns, Ben Jonson, from you, and placed him on the other side; we must dispute Butler with you, because the scene of his education is doubtful.[1] There are probable reasons to believe (see Wood) that he was entered at Christ-Church, from Westminster; but as he was not matriculated, this cannot be proved; and we may venture to say, neither can you prove the contrary.

[1] If we follow Longueville, who says that he was educated at the Grammar School of Worcester, we shall be far from corroborating the critic's assertion.

The list therefore of eminent poets educated at a very small number of great schools, opposed to all England, Scotland, and Ireland, is the following:

Ben Jonson,	Prior,	Collins,
Milton,	Otway,	Gilbert West,
Crashaw,	Young,	Dyer,
Cowley,	J. Phillips,	Lyttleton,
Butler, (doubtful)	Rowe,	Churchill,
Dryden,	Addison,	Cowper.
Waller,	Gray,	

The far greater part of these were educated at two schools only, Winchester and Westminster.

Before we leave this article, I must add a few more remarks, to which I beg the reader's attention.

What has been quoted from Ben Jonson cuts two ways; proving not only the place from which he derived his learning; but his modesty and piety, as well as the humility and kindness of his master: so far was either, as clearly appears from their life and writings,

from assuming that "public school importance, which ridiculously and offensively displays itself in the haunts and business of bearded men."

It was usual, soon after Wolsey's college was completed, to send the principal young men of birth and fashion to be educated there as at a public school; they went very early, and received the same discipline as they would at Eton or Winchester; for it must be remembered that Westminster was not placed upon its present establishment till Queen Elizabeth; and the Dean, Censor, and Tutor, acted literally the part of schoolmasters. To this Public School, for it could be called by no other name, we owe the accomplished and learned Lord Surrey, Sir Philip Sidney, and others equally eminent with those who are brought against us. Of Sir Philip Sidney, Wood writes thus: "*while very young*, he was sent to Christ-Church to be improved in all sorts of learning."

The same may be said of other great characters in English history, who were sent to Oxford, to the Public Schools attached to different colleges: Sir Walter Raleigh to Oriel; Rochester to Wadham, at twelve; Wolsey, so early as *eleven* years old, to Magdalen; Richard Hooker, at *thirteen*, to Corpus; Clarendon, at *thirteen*, to Christ-Church. These accomplished characters, said by the Critic not to have been educated in Public Schools, were all, in fact, so EDUCATED!

"O Shame, where is thy blush!
If thou canst mutiny on a *Critic's* cheek!"

Of Sir Walter Raleigh, Wood says: Being entered at Oriel, "where his natural parts being *strangely advanced* by academical learning under an excellent tutor, he became an ornament to the *juniors*." The same may be said of many other eminent men, whom England has produced, in history, in science, and in learning; and many of these enumerated in the review before us, Bacon, Selden, Sir Isaac Newton, &c. So that, if these great men have

not been educated at Westminster, Eton, or Winchester, still they are direct examples against the fallacious conclusion drawn by the Reviewer; that "the English have done almost all that they have done in the arts and sciences, without the aid of that system of education, to which they are attached." [1]

This will be explained more particularly as we proceed. It may be proper to mention here, that we shall consider in the sequel, whether the great men, who were privately educated, would not have been more free from imperfections, if they had been educated otherwise.

The reader has already seen the formidable array of Poets drawn up by the Reviewer against the number of those educated at *Public Schools;* and he has also seen some of those, who have been produced by a very few of our great establishments.

[1] Among the poets enumerated by the critic, it may also be observed that Congreve, Goldsmith, Parnell, and Smith, began their studies at Trinity College, Dublin, at the age of thirteen.

Before I proceed with the examination of the other names invidiously introduced against them, I beg permission to state that my object is not to detract from the fair fame of any person, but merely to vindicate the mode of education, which has been traduced. Far be it from me to assert or imagine that many splendid examples of worth and cultivated talents are not to be found among those who have been educated in a private manner, or that *Public Schools* must monopolise all the worth and wisdom of the state. Some have received their education at Public Schools and English Universities, of whom Public Schools and English Universities might well be ashamed; —and some have received a private education, of whom public establishments might well be proud. I am not very anxious to obviate the reader's conclusion, to which class the Critic in question may belong.

Far be also from me the wish to detract "one iota" from the fair fame of the Historians, Metaphysicians, Poets, or even Critics of the

North;—but let them not endeavour to pluck from their seats all those, who have reached intellectual eminence by a different mode of culture, and who are as ready to admit their just claims, as they appear on all occasions desirous of injuring ours.

Having premised these observations for fear of being misunderstood, I now proceed to speak of men of SCIENCE, entreating the reader to keep in mind the first question asked by the Reviewer, whether good and wise men are produced by our *Public Schools;* and also another proposition, which is artfully combined with it, that the English have excelled in *arts* and *sciences without the aid of that mode of education, to which they are so partial.*

First, of *Sciences.*—With these, even if they were introduced in Public Schools, as early and necessary objects of education, a boy could not be supposed to gain any deep acquaintance. When we consider, however, the proposition, that "the English have done

almost all that they have done in Science, without the aid of that system of education, to which they are so much attached,"—the charge is false. Sir Isaac Newton, by far the greatest name in science, which the world can boast, "did what he did" (to repeat the critic's elegant expression [1]) *with*, not *without*, the aid of that system of education. The same may be said of Wallis, educated at Oxford. Halley and the great Boyle were both educated at our Public Schools; the former at St. Paul's School, the latter at Eton.

I shall not here follow the exact arrangement of the Reviewer, in going from Science to History; but from Science shall at once proceed to Arts; as neither the one nor the

[1] It is no less lamentable than astonishing, that a publication, containing many excellent articles on classical and literary criticism, and on political economy, should be disgraced by such expressions as the following, taken from a late Number: "*After* war has continued too long, and the people *get tired of it*, they hurry their leaders into any treaty, *whereby it may be got rid of*."

other are said by him to have derived any benefit from our English mode of education. "If I mistake not," I have manifestly proved in some instances the futility of argument, and in others the direct and palpable falsehood of the Reviewer's assertion. I trust I shall here as fairly establish, as I have proposed before, the total irrelevancy of his remarks, not only with respect to Arts, but Arms; as our opponent's list is swelled not only with Painters, Architects, and Actors, but with Marlborough and Clive.

Of the former there are various kinds: the Art of Painting, the Art of Music, the Art of Acting, and the Art of Dancing *on the slack rope*;—for one Art might as well be introduced as another, not certainly with respect to their importance or dignity, but with respect to their utter incompatibility, or assimilation, with the studies of a Public School. It is therefore probable that the Painters, the Actors, and the Generals, were put into the list, by a kind of conscription, to daunt us by

their array; or perhaps only as figurantes at an opera dance, to make a more imposing glitter and parade; or like Nebuchadnezzar's "all sorts of instruments," for the sake of greater sound. The least reflection must convince any one that, to be a Painter,—and those, who chiefly practise that delightful art, practise it as a profession,—requires so early an apprenticeship, that the time employed in a Public School would be misemployed by those who wish to attain such a degree of excellence in it as to gain either its highest fame or its honorable emoluments. None, therefore, can be supposed to reach any high proficiency, who with our accustomed education practise it merely from taste and attachment: yet even this concession must not be taken in an unqualified sense; for at this moment an individual, distinguished by every thing that can exalt the character of a highly educated English gentleman in manners, worth, and accomplishments, almost rivals the first professors in this art; and received his education at

Eton and at New College; I speak of Sir George Beaumont.

What is said of the incompatibility of our studies with this Art as a profession, may be also said of others, such as Architecture. We must, therefore, relinquish Inigo Jones and Vanburgh, as well as Reynolds and Gainsborough.

In the Critic's list we find but one Actor; but I have no hesitation to admit that the numbers of that profession not educated at Public Schools are very considerable! Yet even in the solitary instance mentioned, we might ask this accurate writer whether he has never heard that Garrick was educated, as well as Samuel Johnson, at Lichfield School, a public establishment of considerable repute? We might bring to his recollection one of the first Actors of his time, Smith, who still, at an advanced age, enlivens society with his wit and learning, and who received his education at Eton. But to bring this Goliah of ignorance to the ground, we shall bring one little stone from the sling

of truth. We will beg the favor of him to look into a place called the "Poets' Corner," in Westminster Abbey. The first object that will strike him is a bust, under which is inscribed in large letters, O RARE BEN JONSON. This name, "if we mistake not," he will remember as long as he lives. When he has refreshed his memory as to the place of education of this distinguished character, let him turn round, and he may read the following Epitaph:

In Memory of BARTON BOOTH, Esq.
Descended from the ancient family of that name
In the County of Lancaster. In his early youth
He was admitted into the COLLEGIATE SCHOOL of
WESTMINSTER, under the CELEBRATED Dr. BUSBY,
Where he soon discover'd and improv'd a genius,
Which (favour'd by the Muse he lov'd)
So happily combin'd
The expressive powers of Acting
With a peculiar grace of Elocution,
As not only procur'd him the Royal Patronage,
But the grateful Applause
Of a judicious Public.
He died in 1733, in the 54th year of his age,

Very justly regretted
By all who knew how to estimate
Abilities in an Actor,
Politeness in a Gentleman,
Fidelity in a Friend.

This eminent actor was the first in his line before the time of Garrick, and was as exemplary for every domestic virtue, as for the greatest talent in his profession.

As these Arts are so distinctly enumerated, we are tempted to wonder that a very interesting sister-Art was omitted. Neither Orlando Gibbons nor Purcell learned their gamut at Westminster School, although Music was particularly required in our ecclesiastical establishments. Even at All-Souls-College, in Oxford, where young men of family are chiefly admitted, it is ordered in the statutes of the Founder that the claimants shall be *benè nati, benè vestiti, et mediocriter docti;* not, as some have represented the meaning of *docti*, in general learning, but *in arte Musicâ.* Peacham also in his "Complete Gentleman,"

requires him to be so well instructed in Music, as to *be able to take his part, at sight, in any catch or canon.* Notwithstanding, therefore, the antiquity, celebrity or necessity of this Art as an accomplishment to a perfect gentleman, nothing is said of it in the article before us; nor is any hint given of the advantage, which might have been received by Salomon, Cervetto, or the late Gariboldi, on the double bass, if they had begun their performances in the dormitory at Westminster, to the great recreation of the scholars after their severer studies. The cause of this omission perhaps may be found in the prejudice of the Scotch, like the Swiss, to their own mountain Music, who feel no partiality to any strains but such as "Maggie Lauder," or "Open the door, Lord Gregory!"

I think, however, it would have been better if this Art had been admitted among the others; and more particularly as such recreations as Cricket, &c. are exploded. For to the Art of Music might naturally be added,

as equally proper to be taught in our Public Schools, the Art of Dancing; and if this had been the case, so much more attention would probably have been paid: in which case we might expect to see the Rev. Head-Masters of some of our most distinguished seminaries of classical learning "go to church in a galliard, and come home in a corranto!"—*Shakes. Twelfth Night. Act i. Sc. 4.*

In this manner, the boys of our Public Schools might be taught, not only Latin and Greek, but all other necessary arts and accomplishments. Each young gentleman, just come from his brothers and sisters in the country, like the Bourgeois Gentilhomme in Molière, should be surrounded by his several tutors, the Music-master, the Dancing-master, the Language-master, the Fencing-master; but great care should be taken to keep the Moral-philosophy-master in good humor, and not to suffer him to kick the other Masters into the street.[1]

[1] See Molière's exquisite comedy.

This point, not of argument, but of courteous etiquette, being arranged, let us come to the more formidable Moral Philosophers.

Before, however, we enter into a particular examination of the respective claims and character of the catalogue, let us first observe that, as in Poetry, so in the various branches of Science, it should be inquired what proportion of illustrious men Public Schools have produced, in comparison with the whole mass of educated population. If we estimate the population of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, at 15 millions, we may probably take one hundred thousand men, who have received a classical education. Of those, not much more than two thousand five hundred are brought up in the Public Schools; and these are to be weighed, as to eminent characters produced, against the educated population assumed; that is to say, in the proportion of *one* to *forty*. This calculation is not perhaps very accurate; but it is sufficient to prove that the number of men of eminence produced

by Public Schools, and chiefly by Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, constitutes a singularly large proportion of the whole. This proportion will clearly show the futility of the argument, and the fallacy of the statement, of the Reviewer.

In estimating the number of illustrious men produced by the different parts of the British Islands, it has been often remarked that Wales has furnished a comparatively small proportion. The hardy simplicity and the sturdy independence, which characterise the mind of the Welsh, should have fitted their genius for those daring flights of enthusiasm, which have drawn the admiration of mankind on the inhabitants of Greece and Italy, as well as of our own countrymen, in similar circumstances. But the cause of this deficiency is not to be sought in physical reasons; it is to be ascribed to the want of establishments for public education. The zealous and animating efforts of the present Bishop of St. David's, will, it is reasonably expected, remove the obstacles to

liberal instruction in the principality, by the public institutions, which he is so beneficially employed in founding and promoting: "Quod Deus benè vertat!"

To proceed to the formidable host of Moral Philosophers, like Poets, set in array against us. It will be here necessary to act the part of Helen in the Iliad, of the Messenger in Æschylus, and of the Tutor in Euripides, to describe these mighty leaders sent by the Caledonian general to force our lines of defence. We first descry, "clarum et venerabile nomen," Bacon. Then follow the seven chiefs, Shaftesbury, Hobbes, Berkeley, Butler, Hume, Hartley, and Dugald Stewart.

Bacon, the highest and the noblest name, if not educated at a Public School, was sent at the age of twelve to Cambridge. This, as we have before observed, constituted a public education, and that "to which the English are so much attached." However considerable might have been the natural powers of his mind, he could at that time have known very little of that

Philosophy, which laid the foundation of the Novum Organum.

As for the next on the list, Shaftesbury, his example proves rather too much; for it operates equally against Scotch and other Universities as English, and indeed against most of our modes of education, private or public. Shaftesbury,—and a scholar he was, whatever may be thought of his philosophy, a "wise and good one,"—obtained his scholarship in a very singular way. It would puzzle a person, unacquainted with his history, to conjecture by what mode of education he acquired so great a stock of classical and elegant learning. It was not at a public, it was not at a private, school; it was not at a University, English, Irish, Scotch, or Dutch, under an English clergyman or a Chemical dissenter. It was under a lady, a learned and excellent blue-stocking spinster. Now, whether this mode should be hereafter thought best to be adopted, in preference either to Scotch Universities or English Schools, it should at least be mention-

ed. This act of justice being performed, with due compliments to the amiable and learned, but novel teacher, we must convict the Reviewer of another instance of ignorance. Shaftesbury was afterwards actually sent to *Winchester School;* but, no doubt recollecting with tenderness the more lenient and endearing instructress, and the "mollia tempora fandi," which he had so often experienced; and perhaps frightened by the formidable painting of a rod in the School, with the corresponding motto, AUT DISCE, AUT DISCEDE; MANET SORS TERTIA CÆDI, he did not remain long in that seminary. This example may operate against the system I defend, as well as against the Critic; except that it does not subject *me* to the charge of ignorance.

Of the others it may be hinted to the reader, that Berkeley entered very young at Trinity College, Dublin, Hartley at Cambridge, and Hobbes at Oxford.

As to great names distinguished in Moral and Natural Philosophy, let the Critic give us

Boyle, Locke, Sir Francis Bacon, and Sir Isaac Newton; and he is welcome to all the rest. Boyle and Locke were educated at Eton and Westminster. With respect to Bacon and Newton, when I have stated the circumstances of their education, I shall leave the reader to judge which mode of instruction has a just claim to them.

Sir Francis Bacon had the extraordinary advantage, during his infant years, of the instruction of a father and mother, which, if such could often be found, might supersede any other mode of education, at least for the earlier period of life. The father was the well known Sir Nicholas Bacon, and the mother one of the daughters of Sir Antony Cooke, tutor to Edward VI. But, notwithstanding these advantages, with such a father as is not often found, and with such a mother as centuries do not produce, he was not suffered by his discerning parents to remain at home, and he was sent to Cambridge in the twelfth year of his age, a period of life, at which boys are generally sent to Public Schools.

And now, a word on the greatest luminary, that has ever enlightened the world of human learning, who stands, like his own Sun, glorious and alone, in the centre of knowledge and science, among the inferior bodies, that shed their feeble rays round the majestic orb, from which they are derived. Sir Isaac Newton, I assert in the teeth of the Critic's assertion, received his education at a Public School; for the school of Grantham cannot be otherwise designated, and indeed strictly falls within the Critic's own definition of a Public School. This school, like Winchester and Eton, was an Episcopal and Royal foundation. The first foundation was by Bishop Fox; and a further charter, with considerable additions, was granted by Edward VI; and the principle of the great founders of Winchester and Eton was followed in every respect, provision being made for an Informator, a Pædagogus, &c. When Sir Isaac Newton was there, the school was in its most florishing state. Here he instructed the other boys in the best mode of

making paper kites; here he made a small wooden mill, and put a mouse into it for a miller; and here,—tremble all yé papas and mamas, who are afraid of the tyranny of a great school!—here he received (horresco referens!) a "kick in the belly" from another boy, whom he thrashed, and whose place he took.[1]

Without deducing all Sir Isaac's wonderful discoveries from this "kick in the belly," which Voltaire might have done, it is sufficient to show that he was educated at a Public School, and had his share, greater than happens to boys in general, of the *roughness* of one.

[1] This curious fact is asserted by his own nephew, who attended him in his last moments, and who was in his greatest confidence. "Sir I. Newton," says he, "used to relate that he was very negligent at school, and very low in it, until the boy above him gave him *a kick in the belly*. Not content with having thrashed his adversary, Sir Isaac could not rest till he had got before him in the school, and from that time continued rising till he was the head-boy." Conduit. *History of Grantham*, p. 158.

As I consider that I am writing in answer to a person, whose information is not very extensive, I shall take the opportunity of telling him a few more circumstances, relating to Sir Isaac Newton's progress in science, and which will equally display the triumph of the English mode of education.

When he left school, there was an end of his mills, and mouse-traps, and paper kites, and sun-dials. His mother was now married again, and he was appointed an overseer, or bailiff, in her farm. In this occupation, he regularly, invitâ Minervâ, attended the fairs and markets, and chaffered with farmer Lumpkin, and squire Bumpkin, all educated privately, about the price of corn, hay, pigs, peas, and beans. So for some time lived, and so probably would have died, the great Sir Isaac Newton! It happened, however, that his mother had a brother, who had been educated at Cambridge, the Rev. Mr. Ayscough, by whose advice young farmer Newton was taken from his homely occupation, and sent to Tri-

nity College, Cambridge, the place of his uncle's education, where he obtained a fellowship. The rest followed.

Reviewers are not apt to blush; but it is possible that he, to whom these facts are addressed, may blush for the first time in his life!

It is not necessary to examine any more of his instances in Philosophy; in which, as we may boast of Boyle, Locke, Bacon, and Newton, he may take and place the rest in his scale, with all the moral philosophers and metaphysicians born and educated on the north of the Tweed, with Lord Monboddo, that learned advocate of human tails, as a makeweight.

What has been said of the incompatibility of the Arts of Painting, Architecture, &c. with a Public education, must also be applied to the Military Art. If, however, such a man as Marlborough had spent a few years at a Public School, he would have been able to write and spell a little better than he did; and

it is more than probable that, by the example of noble and honorable equals, he would have been early taught to despise that penuriousness, which attended him through life; and at least he would have escaped the name and character of Lawyer Hocus.[1]

This leads me to consider the list of Lawyers, of a very different character, enumerated by the Reviewer: Sir Edward Coke, Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Hardwicke, and Chief Justice Holt. This enumeration is unfortunate, and so far from operating against the

[1] He appeared so sensible of the disadvantages of his want of education, that he sent his only son to Cambridge.

It may be here observed, that fewer military men are likely in future to be sent from Public Schools. The new establishment at Sandhurst requires boys to be sent at so early an age for military instruction, that the future race of British officers will probably be ignorant of classical literature; and should we see a man of deep learning in the army, we shall compare

——bimembri
Hoc monstrum puero, vel mirandis sub aratro
Piscibus inventis.

system of English education, makes in favor of it. Sir Edward Coke was educated at Norwich School, and was sent very early to Cambridge, for he was there four complete years. Perhaps it is to be lamented that he did not stay to be whipped a little longer at Norwich, as he most undoubtedly would have been at Eton and Westminster: we then probably should not have seen a man of the most profound legal knowledge so impatient of opposition, and so brutal as he often was in his conduct to the prisoners tried before him. He called a great and unfortunate man, on his trial, "a spider of hell;" and of Mrs. Turner, when tried for her life, he said she was guilty of the seven deadly sins, which he enumerated with little regard to humanity or delicacy. Sir John Holt was educated at Abingdon School, and at Oxford. Sir Matthew Hale had indeed a very confined, puritanical education. The "system of premature debauchery," mentioned by the Critic, was thoroughly adopted by him after this private instruction:

and it was not until he entered on a course of public education at Oxford, that he shook off the evil habits of his younger days, and devoted himself to study.[1]

[1] On the consequences of a confined mode of education, the observations of Dean Swift are so just and decisive, that the reader will not be displeased to see them here. Speaking of the young heir to a large property, bred up in private, he says:

"He is taught from the nursery that he must inherit a great estate, and has no need to mind his book, which is a lesson he never forgets to the end of his life. His chief solace is to steal down and play at span-farthing with the page or young blackamoor, or little favorite foot-boy, one of whom is his principal confident and bosom friend.

"There is one young Lord in this town, who, by an unexampled piece of good fortune, was miraculously snatched out of the gulph of ignorance, confined to a public School for a due term of years, well whipped when he deserved it, clad no better than his comrades, and always their play-fellow on the same footing, had no precedence in the school but what was given him by his merit, and lost it whenever he was negligent. It is well known how many mutinies were bred at this unprecedented treatment, what complaints among his

It should not be forgotten that Lord Mansfield was educated at Westminster; and that Blackstone went from a public school to Oxford, and was a Fellow of a College, when he wrote his admirable Commentaries.

relations, and other great ones of both sexes,—that his stockings and silver clocks were ravished from him; that his dress was undistinguished; that he was not fit to appear at a ball or assembly, nor suffered to go to either.

"It is true, I have known an academical education to have been exploded in public assemblies; and have heard persons of high rank declare that they could learn nothing more at Oxford and Cambridge than to drink ale and smoke tobacco; wherein I firmly believed them; but they were all young heirs sent thither only for form, either from schools, where they were not suffered by their careful parents to stay above three months in the year, or from under the management of French family tutors, who yet often attended them to their college to prevent all possibility of improvement. But I never yet knew any one person of quality, who followed his studies at the University, and carried away his just proportion of learning, that was not ready upon all occasions to celebrate and defend that course of education."—Essay on Modern Education, Vol. v. Ed. London, 1801. p. 128.

I shall include the Chemists and great Medical writers under one head. These are Priestley, Black, and Davy; and Harvey, Cheselden, Hunter, Jenner, Meade, Brown, and Cullen.

Here our pretensions are naturally small; yet we cannot entirely acquiesce with the adversary of public education. Harvey, the great Columbus of the tribe, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, was educated at Canterbury School, and began his studies at Cambridge at the age of 14. Without stopping to inquire how many of these were originally bred to Surgery, which requires an early apprenticeship, we are content to leave the rest of the Chemists and medical men, "Ambubaiarum Collegia, Pharmacopolæ," to a different education: nor shall we even contend for those renowned ornaments of a SCOTCH UNIVERSITY, Dr. BRODUM, and Dr. SOLOMON!![1]

[1] I hope it will not be conceived that I could mean to speak with the least disrespect of a numerous body of learned, intelligent, and humane Physicians, either of

I now proceed to speak of characters far more to the point—Historians, eminent Scholars, and Statesmen. If our Public Schools are deficient in producing these, particularly eminent Scholars and Statesmen, the question must be given up. I shall, as before, make some observations on the list here produced, and then see what can be said on the other side, not fearing to leave the result to the opinion of all impartial judges.

"The three best Historians that the English language has produced, Clarendon, Hume, and Robertson, were not educated at Public Schools." So says the Review.

We have already mentioned that Clarendon was sent to Oxford at thirteen years of age; he, therefore, may justly be enumerated among those educated at Public Schools, and certainly after that form, "to which the English are

England or Scotland, nor above all of Sir Humphrey Davy, the most eminent character that his particular line of science ever produced.

so much," and with great reason, "attached." Let us now examine more attentively the characters of Hume and Robertson as historians; and we are not disposed to detract in the smallest degree from their deserved reputation. Hume was fluent, perspicuous, eloquent; of copious, but correct, diction, and most happy in embellishing his narrative with those colors of rhetoric that are powerful in winning and disposing his readers on the side to which he had devoted his talents. At the same time, he was wanting in that which is most essential to the cool investigation of truth; fidelity, accuracy, impartiality. So negligent indeed is he in this respect, that his text is not unfrequently found to be in direct opposition to the very authority he quotes.—Robertson stands very high as a judicious, elegant, and discriminating writer; but, bating the amenities of style and language, it is extraordinary to think how little of new light has been thrown by his researches on the periods which he has

so pleasingly, I had almost said superficially, illustrated. Let it be observed, however, that Robertson had the advantage of the highest public education in his country. But even if we should confine ourselves to our three greatest Public Schools, have we not Camden, the annalist of Queen Elizabeth, and the great and venerable father of historical topography, educated at Westminster? have we not Gibbon,[1] who, though unfortunately prejudiced on one great point, has dispelled the darkness of the middle ages, and exhibited them as they stand in connexion with the more authentic periods of Roman History,—brought up at Westminster? Have we not also Coxe, educa-

[1] It is to be lamented that, in consequence of his weak and sickly constitution when a boy, he was deprived of the regular course of studies, and was therefore many years incessantly occupied in recovering the ground he had lost. Had he been able to go through the regular education of Westminster, it is probable that his conduct would have been more steady, and his principles more sound.

ted at Eton, whose Histories of Austria, and of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, may surely be placed on the same shelf with any work of Robertson; and whose Life and Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole have superseded all other accounts of the reigns of George I. and II. All these were bred as private gentlemen; and without taking into consideration the exceptions we have made, even as historical writers, they evidently turn the scale in favor of Public Schools.

In speaking of eminent Scholars, I must examine, as before, the list produced by the Critic. Among them we have such eminent names as "Jeremy Taylor, Cardinal Wolsey, Bishop Wilkins, Chillingworth, and Isaac Hooker." Most of these are well known as distinguished for their learning and great qualities; but who is this *Isaac Hooker?* Dr. Johnson mentions a singular character, who, in a very intelligent company was observed to utter only one word: this word, subsequent information has decided to have been "RICH-

ARD." It is a pity this personage had not been at the Reviewer's elbow, that he might have prompted him to write *Richard*, instead of *Isaac*, Hooker. It is probable that this very accurate writer might have intended to put in this place the name of Isaac *Barrow*; but finding that Barrow had a Public School education, he put out *Barrow*, and let *Isaac* remain. Of Hooker's writings it is likely that the notable Reviewer knows as little as he appears to have done of the works of Ben Jonson; we will therefore,—after giving him his right name, as we have to Jonson,—extract one sentence from the preface to his unrivalled work, Ecclesiastical Polity, which ought to be written in letters of gold for the edification and improvement of some writers: "*There will come a time, when three words, uttered with* CHARITY *and* MEEKNESS, *shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with* DISDAINFUL SHARPNESS OF WIT." Hooker was sent to Oxford at an early age.

Cardinal Wolsey was a member of the same University at eleven years of age, if we may judge from the appellation of "the boy bachelor," which he received for taking his degree at fifteen. Bishop Wilkins went to Oxford also at the same age. The acute and wonderful Chillingworth, the great master of Locke in reasoning, was educated in the Public Academical School attached to Magdalen College, Oxford: and the eloquent, elevated, and holy Jeremy Taylor was so early instructed at Cambridge, that Antony Wood, in his quaint manner, says; "he tumbled out of his mother's womb into the seat of the Muses at Cambridge." It may be proper to observe that, of the other eminent characters mentioned, Cudworth, Tillotson, Middleton, Bentley, Bishop Sherlock, Stillingfleet, Spelman, Clarke, and Bishop Hoadley,[1] went early to Cambridge; Selden, Sir Thomas More, and Bishop Wilkins, to Oxford; and Archbishop

[1] These two last were educated at Norwich School.

King, and Bishop Usher, to Trinity College Dublin.

We now come to the Statesmen and great political characters. Without strictly examining the whole list, which is full of inaccuracies, the following observations will, I trust, be sufficient to show how confidently we may appeal from the decisions of the Reviewer, on this important criterion. I therefore request the attention of the reader to the following circumstances.

When the Puritans obtained the predominance in the State, and particularly after the famous visitation by the *godly* Commissioners at Oxford,[1] the establishments of education

[1] When men so eminent for learning, piety, and every Christian virtue, as Sanderson, Hammond,* and Dr. Pococke, were reduced to beggary; when the Soldiers preached in the Public Schools and Churches against human learning, challenging the Scholars to prove their calling from Christ, and denouncing Greek as the sin against the Holy Ghost.——It may not be

* Hammond was educated at Eton, and first went there, according to Walker, "in his long coats."

lost their repute. These venerable seats,—which in the reign of Henry, Elizabeth, and James, had produced such characters in the political world as Sir Thomas More, Lord Surrey, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Walter Raleigh; and afterwards, such men as Lord Falkland and Clarendon; and even the best and most accomplished of the Republicans, as Milton, Marvel, Whitelocke, and Selden,—were now filled with a generation as ignorant as they were canting and rapacious. Thus, during twelve or fifteen years there was a kind of lapse of that education, which had produced such characters as I have enumerated. During this period, Hugh Peters adorned the pulpit; and such monsters as "Praise God Barebones,"

improper to mention here that these pious visitors, with Lord Pembroke at their head, found no great difficulty in dispossessing, among other eminent sufferers, Dr. Fell, Dean of Christ-Church and Vice-Chancellor; but Mrs. Fell, the Doctor's wife, "refused to budge." Intreaties, commands, were all in vain: at last, after "*seeking the Lord*" they put her by force into an arm-chair, brought her into the quadrangle, and locked the door!

were called to fill the seats of the Senate. It was some years before the nation recovered from this intellectual hiatus, if the expression may be allowed. After the Restoration[1] the national education went on in its usual channel; but it was not till near the approach of the Revolution that the fruits were perceived. The reign of James II, it has been observed, was remarkably deficient in illustrious men. Sir William Temple was still respected and revered, among a race of venal and profligate courtiers. At length appeared Lord Somers, and the great leaders of his day; who were succeeded, in a subsequent reign, by Bolingbroke, Walpole, Townshend, Chesterfield, Pulteney, all educated at Eton or Westminster. These were followed by the great William Pitt, and his illustrious opponent Henry Fox.

[1] It is a fact, that Rochester was sent to Oxford after its puritanical regeneration. Educated among the saints of the day, at the restoration, like many others, he burst into the contrary extreme, and was notorious only for his talents and profligacy. Dryden was also sent to Cambridge during the ascendancy of the fanatics.

and the leading political characters of the middle of the last century. It really seems that the writer of the Review, from a natural hebetude of understanding, or from ignorant conceit, which, in him, even a public education could not cure, has run his head against the very point, which is most pregnant with illustrious examples, in opposition to his arguments. Let him look at the living. Let him look at the Houses of Lords and Commons. Let him look to the most eminent public characters, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Grenville, Lord Grey, Lord Holland. Let him look at the great leaders of every party, Wellesley, Liverpool, Sidmouth, Canning, and Whitbread. Let him look at an eminent proof of the result of Public education, in the Speakers of the House of Commons, whose situation requires an assemblage and union of the highest qualities of the mind; and he will find this arduous and honorable post almost universally occupied by men who have been educated at Public Schools; for instance, Cornwall and Adding-

ton at Winchester, Grenville at Eton, and Abbot at Westminster.[1] We may here remark that almost all the characters enumerated ἐν προμάχοις of the political world were distinguished for their classical attainments in youth. We may refer to Fox's poetical compositions in the *Musæ Etonenses*. Wellesley, Grenville, Sidmouth, Abbot, and Canning, gained University Prizes. Nor ought we to forget the late accomplished Windham.

But even in the list of Statesmen produced by the Reviewer, we shall find that the great-

[1] The conductors of those great establishments surely deserve the encouragement and remuneration which they, in general, receive from the state. We hail a head-master of Westminster exalted to the rank of Archbishop, as was the case with Markham: we congratulate the otium cum dignitate of so excellent a man, and so distinguished a scholar, as the late Dean of Westminster. Of only one, for many years master of Winchester, it may be said, he has been ungratefully neglected, Dr. Goddard. He may say to those whom he has so ably instructed—

Disce, puer, virtutem ex me, verumque laborem,
Fortunam ex aliis.

est number enjoyed the advantage of a public education. Lord Somers, Sir Walter Raleigh, Hampden and Sidney, were members at an early age of the University of Oxford; the Earl of Strafford, Sir William Temple, Walsingham, Cromwell, the late W. Pitt,[1] of that of Cambridge; and Burke of Trinity College, Dublin. Sheridan, consigned likewise by the critic to private instruction, was educated in one of those public Schools, "conducted" in his own words, "upon the plan of the three first," and doomed by him to the same reprobation.

I cannot conclude these observations without earnestly begging the reader's attention to a

[1] We confess our inability to understand the Critic's object in introducing Mr. Pitt here. That man, who, in his estimate, entailed such calamities on the country, had not, according to him, a public education! Of this great man we may truly say, that the chief fault in his character, an haughty reserve, would probably have been completely cured by an education at a Public School.

striking fact, of which I proposed to speak when I took into consideration that part of the Critic's question, "whether Public Schools furnished wiser and *better* men?" I shall here entreat the reader to look at the list of Poets only, furnished by a few great Schools; and I do this because there exists a vulgar and almost proverbial error, respecting the moral character of Poets. Many persons, for want of knowledge, consideration, or candor, are apt to think that the name of a Poet in modern days is synonymous with eccentricity, if not with profligacy. Now look at the list! With the exception of one only, in so large a list, which might still be increased, all are men, whose private life was irreproachable: their morals were as correct, as their talents were extraordinary. Of men so educated, and so mannered, who can speak without respect, not of the poetry only, but of their private life?—Whether we contemplate the lofty morality and severe wisdom of Milton; the amiable sweetness of Cowley; the exalted and

refined purity of Gray; the cultivated intelligence and mild Christian benignity of Addison; the kind-hearted amenity of Rowe; the retired seriousness and pensive accomplishments of Dyer; the lofty and impassioned piety of Young; the tender and religious enthusiasm of Collins; the hermit-like sanctity of Cowper. To these may be added Gilbert West, speaking of whom Johnson says—in him, as well as Crashawe, the venerable names of poet and saint were united.

In this picture of the character of our best Poets, there is not the least exaggeration. Not one of them was marked by that overweening conceit, which the Critic asserts to be the general produce of Public Schools; nor disgraced by those glaring and eccentric singularities of conduct, which have sometimes characterized men of that class differently educated. Churchill is the chief exception; but it should be remembered that he ran away from School, and received a very imperfect and desultory education: had he been trained

into life by a regular course of study, the roughness of his temper would have been smoothed by the collision of a large society; he would have been at least as good a Poet, and certainly a better man.

Having left the reader to consider this plain, but, I trust, convincing statement, I might make our cause still more triumphant by adding some remarks on those Poets, differently instructed, who have received from their contracted mode of education a tincture of vanity, which has stained their life with irritated egotism; or who have brought dishonor on the very name of genius by disgusting conceit, by nauseating affectation, or by brutal intemperance.

Such a poet, not educated at a Public School, Scotland may perhaps recollect; but I spare his name, respect his genius, and commiserate his fate; observing only, in opposition to his biographer, that the light, which led him astray, was *not* "light from heaven."

refined purity of Gray; the cultivated intelligence and mild Christian benignity of Addison; the kind-hearted amenity of Rowe; the retired seriousness and pensive accomplishments of Dyer; the lofty and impassioned piety of Young; the tender and religious enthusiasm of Collins; the hermit-like sanctity of Cowper. To these may be added Gilbert West, speaking of whom Johnson says—in him, as well as Crashawe, the venerable names of poet and saint were united.

In this picture of the character of our best Poets, there is not the least exaggeration. Not one of them was marked by that overweening conceit, which the Critic asserts to be the general produce of Public Schools; nor disgraced by those glaring and eccentric singularities of conduct, which have sometimes characterized men of that class differently educated. Churchill is the chief exception; but it should be remembered that he ran away from School, and received a very imperfect and desultory education: had he been trained

into life by a regular course of study, the roughness of his temper would have been smoothed by the collision of a large society; he would have been at least as good a Poet, and certainly a better man.

Having left the reader to consider this plain, but, I trust, convincing statement, I might make our cause still more triumphant by adding some remarks on those Poets, differently instructed, who have received from their contracted mode of education a tincture of vanity, which has stained their life with irritated egotism; or who have brought dishonor on the very name of genius by disgusting conceit, by nauseating affectation, or by brutal intemperance.

Such a poet, not educated at a Public School, Scotland may perhaps recollect; but I spare his name, respect his genius, and commiserate his fate; observing only, in opposition to his biographer, that the light, which led him astray, was *not* "light from heaven."

I have dwelt the longer on this part of the subject, because Poets are by some considered as a suspicious race, as far as morals are concerned; but on this point we may as triumphantly appeal to their characters, as we might in philosophy to those of a Boyle and a Locke.

I leave these considerations to the public, to parents and guardians, who, from what has appeared in the E. Review, might hesitate on the best mode of educating their children. It will be recollected that I have not entered into the general arguments, which might be used for or against Public Schools. I have only answered, and, I hope, to the conviction of every impartial judge, the unaccountable statement of a writer, who thought he could annihilate these institutions at a blow, as easily as a stroke of Harlequin's wooden sword can destroy the castles at Westminster Bridge Amphitheatre. But the blundering Pantaloon has aimed his blow with different effect: not a vane on the pinnacles of our ancient estab-

lishments has been moved: they regard not the wooden sword of such an assailant; nor are their children frightened by the knife of Shylock, or the swagger and jargon of ancient Pistol![1]

I have thus taken the pains of following step by step the course of argument, and examining the hostile positions of this great opponent of English Schools. However formidable his arguments, and confident his assertions, may appear to those, who have not attentively considered the subject, they have nothing more real than an African Mumbo Jumbo, which at first sight causes some alarm, but on a closer approach, exhibits nothing but rags and straw. The cause of Public education has indeed had other defenders. The learned and excellent Dr. Vincent has triumphantly vindicated Public Schools, when they had received a partial, but serious attack. Mr. Copleston

[1] Alluding to the anglo-latinized alliterations so common in the Review, such as "pugnacious pamphlets," &c. in which often the sole wit consists.

I have dwelt the longer on this part of the subject, because Poets are by some considered as a suspicious race, as far as morals are concerned; but on this point we may as triumphantly appeal to their characters, as we might in philosophy to those of a Boyle and a Locke.

I leave these considerations to the public, to parents and guardians, who, from what has appeared in the E. Review, might hesitate on the best mode of educating their children. It will be recollected that I have not entered into the general arguments, which might be used for or against Public Schools. I have only answered, and, I hope, to the conviction of every impartial judge, the unaccountable statement of a writer, who thought he could annihilate these institutions at a blow, as easily as a stroke of Harlequin's wooden sword can destroy the castles at Westminster Bridge Amphitheatre. But the blundering Pantaloon has aimed his blow with different effect: not a vane on the pinnacles of our ancient estab-

ishments has been moved: they regard not he wooden sword of such an assailant; nor are their children frightened by the knife of Shylock, or the swagger and jargon of ancient Pistol![1]

I have thus taken the pains of following step by step the course of argument, and examining the hostile positions of this great opponent of English Schools. However formidable his arguments, and confident his assertions, may appear to those, who have not attentively considered the subject, they have nothing more real than an African Mumbo Jumbo, which at first sight causes some alarm, but on a closer approach, exhibits nothing but rags and straw. The cause of Public education has indeed had other defenders. The learned and excellent Dr. Vincent has triumphantly vindicated Public Schools, when they had received a partial, but serious attack. Mr. Copleston

[1] Alluding to the anglo-latinized alliterations so common in the Review, such as "pugnacious pamphlets," &c. in which often the sole wit consists.

has no less triumphantly laid low the adversaries of the University of Oxford.

After all, it must be remembered that, although the enumeration of illustrious characters, brought by this writer against the system of Public Schools, has completely turned against himself; although, if I were required to produce a list of those, whose public services and private virtues have been produced and matured by a public education, I might reply,

> "Oceani fluctus me numerare jubes,
> Et maris Ægæi sparsas per littora conchas,
> Et quæ Cecropio monte vagantur apes,——"

for Schools and Universities oppose an invulnerable front to attacks much more formidable than this; yet it is not by the numbers of illustrious characters alone that their value is to be estimated. If I were called upon to state the chief advantage and excellence of Public Schools, I should say that it is their use in forming the *secondary* men; men who carry a cultivated taste, a liberal and manly

understanding and a mild intelligence, into all the retired walks of life, which pervade the country and adorn the city; which convert the Squire Western to an Allworthy, and the Parson of the parish "much bemused in beer" to the well informed clergyman, whose conversation instructs, and whose intellectual attainments improve, the humble circle in which he is destined to move; and who does not disgrace his name and character, when called upon to mix with the most cultivated and elevated ranks of society.

In this point of view, Public Schools are most important to the nation, and ought to receive from the State, which they are the means of improving and adorning, the most substantial encouragement. Great and distinguished characters are few, and their appearance often accidental; but these general effects are beneficial and permanent. Take away this source of improvement, and the face of society is instantly altered;

"Ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri
Spes *Britonum*."

I have now, I trust, proved to the conviction of every dispassionate judge how irrelevant and absurd are the Critic's arguments, and how false, utterly false, is the assertion "that the English have done almost all that they have done in the arts and sciences, without the aid of that system of education, to which they are so much attached:"—False, in regard to great Poets, for the greatest poets and the best men were educated in Public Schools:—False in Philosophy, because Locke and Boyle, one the most mighty developer of the powers of the understanding, and the other the great precursor of Newton, were educated, one at Eton, the other at Westminster; and both as eminent for their goodness and piety, as for their learning. False with respect to Newton, false even with respect to Bacon, because the first was sent to one of our foundation schools, the other entered at Cambridge when the Colleges were conducted on the principles of our great Schools, and at a time of life when boys are often sent to Eton or Westminster:—

False, with regard to Statesmen and eminent political characters; almost all of whom were either brought up at Public Schools, or had the advantage of an early University education, when the Universities were conducted on the plan of Public Schools; where, surrounded by a number of noble and honorable youths, and having the same benefit of emulation and comparison, the young student acquired the accomplishments of a Surrey, or the learning of a Raleigh:—False, particularly in later days, when the value of Public Schools has been more justly appreciated: and when scarcely any, except those who were publicly educated, have made a very distinguished figure in the Senate.

We give up Actors, Painters, Physicians, and Soldiers: we have indeed brought a few instances, for no other purpose than to convict such a reasoner of the irrelevancy of his arguments and the inaccuracy of his assertions.

by feverish and brilliant exertions, sinks disappointed into listlessness, ennui, and stupor —having overthrown in its course the regular means of ascent which have for ages assisted the laborious. It is, therefore, of great importance, at such times, to watch with earnestness and with diligence the venerable institutions to which we may look for steady and permanent lustre, when the meteor glare of the eccentric spirits, who would have hurled them into the dust, is sinking fast into oblivion; amidst all the advances of knowledge to preserve the sources which at all events will keep it from languishing, and to guard that holy flame, which, when once extinguished, there is no Promethean heat which can rekindle. This is unquestionably more safely accomplished when our establishments catch the spirit of the times, and gradually adopt such improvements as may render them more congenial to the popular feeling, and therefore better able to correct it. But they require every exertion to maintain and extend their

influence, especially when they embrace the interests of the youthful part of society, and may temper and mould the character of the future age.

It was not therefore to be expected that, in a season like the present, when every thing new is almost sure to become popular, when methodism has imparted a hue of dark enthusiasm to the multitude, when the spirit of party assumes a thousand shapes with inconceivable rapidity, and when in order to be very original it is almost necessary to be rather ridiculous, our public schools should escape the controversies so freely and so vehemently conducted. The last important discussion of their tendencies was excited by the Edinburgh Reviewers, who denounced a few of their supposed imperfections with great poignancy of satire, some brilliancy of point, and a tone of arrogant superiority, which anonymous critics are so fond of assuming. It is not, however, to their shrewd and flippant objections that I am desirous of again

directing the attention of the public; they have long ago sparkled and expired, and have been rescued from oblivion only by an able refutation in the Classical Journal; but to the honest scruples of a poet, whose influence over the mind of the best and most amiable of our species will never be destroyed while the heart shall be expanded by genuine and tender affections. There is a magical power in the tyrocinium of Cowper, which has awakened in the finest and purest bosoms a deep-rooted prejudice against public seminaries of education; it abounds with so many sweet and natural images, it speaks so touchingly to the inmost sensibilities of the soul, it treats the subject with so conversational a grace, and yet with a solemnity so awfully affecting, that even where it fails to dissuade the parents from the course they feel to be rational and expedient, it makes them tremble with anxiety, accuse themselves of a cruel policy, and regard their child almost as a victim and a sacrifice. The peculiar situation

and character of the excellent author deepens these painful impressions which he has so often unconsciously excited. His awful and dreary melancholy, the warm benevolence of his temper in the midst of his deepest distresses, the devotedness with which he clings to his retirement and his homely pleasures, the gentleness of the touch with which he called again into life all the hidden graces of nature, and opened the sacred places of poetry to the eye long accustomed to gaudier prospects, combine to impart to every relic of his pen a charm beyond the reach of art, and a melody to which numbers can never attain. But the circumstances which throw a sanctity over his production on the subject before us, are the very reasons which unfitted him rightly to estimate its bearings. Formed for retirement and seclusion, weakly and delicate in his frame, and imbued from the cradle with the seeds of hereditary derangement, he was manifestly unfit for the agitation of Westminster school. Under these unfavourable circum-

stances he entered on its lists, and thus from the excitement of his situation and the bustle with which he was surrounded, the secret malady was called into exercise, and the associations of the earlier part of life, which in general are gladsome and delightful, were filled with inexpressible bitterness. He saw all objects relating to the scene of his internal miseries through a false and gloomy medium, and thus was wholly unfitted for correctly pourtraying them. We think we are justified, therefore, in wholly throwing out of the question the authority of his name; and shall examine minutely the arguments he has collected against public education, as they comprise almost the whole of those which succeeding wits, critics, and philosophers, have contrived to polish, to re-model, and to wield as their own.

But in the first place it is necessary to observe, that the favorite scheme of the poet, as opposed to the system he was attempting to overthrow, can never be reduced to general

practice. The picture he draws of a "father, friend, and tutor, all in one," is one of those beautiful images which we sometimes meet with in the haunts of fancy, but which the constitution of society forbids us to look for in the ordinary paths of life. The gentlemen who are engaged in no professional career, agitated by no stirrings of ambition, compelled to no anxious concern for the temporal necessities of their offspring, and, at the same time, fully competent to lead the expanding mind of a spirited youth to the heights of literary eminence, cannot, in the present times, be very numerous. The ability of maintaining a private tutor is confined to a very limited circle, and all the middling orders of society, who, we are told, yet possess "two-thirds of all the virtue that remains," are compelled either to suffer their children to grow up without any learning at all, or to send them to school in order to its acquirement; and the only question for them is as to the size of the seminary in which their characters must be mo-

delled—a question which we shall just notice hereafter, but which Cowper acknowledges to be of very small importance. His delicious dreamings will be of small service to the man who is struggling with all his powers for the independence and comfort of his family, or ardently engaged as a statesman in promoting the interests of the common weal; it will, therefore, afford no small consolation to those who are thus worthily occupied, to know that the dearest pledges of their tenderest connexions are as likely to cheer their declining years, as any mortal hand can make them; and that the venerable institutions, beneath whose shade their talents are unfolding, are favorable alike to their morals, their wisdom, and their happiness.

I. We shall begin with the most important question of all, and that on which the opponents of public schools regard themselves as strongest,—the moral effect of introducing youth into the mingled society of the young. Formidable indeed are the obstacles which

enthusiasm or prejudice conjure up to distress and alarm us: the deadly influence of bad examples, the want of parental care, the early incitement of the passions, the strifes, the heartburnings, and the bad dispositions produced by emulation, and the sad effects of allowing the inexperienced to know the names and the nature of evil. Now, if it were possible for ever to keep the virtue of the young from the touch of pollution, if you could shield them from the assaults of temptation, and hide from them the allurements of pleasure; if you could surround them with a world of your own, in which they should breathe the air of purity and of unruffled delight, these declamations might possibly be founded in reason. But the ordinance of heaven is wisely different. The world is the great school of the human race, in which they are placed by their common and all-wise parent, in order to educate them for a nobler scene of existence; he might have suffered it to lie in one unbroken calm, and have intro-

duced his children at once into all the purities of an immortal Eden. But what is that virtue which has known no trial? that patience which has endured no suffering? that benignity which has forgiven no offences? that hope which has basked in the full sun-shine of enjoyment? that faith which has luxuriated only in prospects scarcely obscured by a cloud? Amidst suffering, and folly, and vice we must mingle, if we would discharge the duties of our common nature by attempting to diminish their amount. If this is the case, the only question that can possibly arise is, whether it is best to send the young all at once into the giddiness and difficulties of the world, or to inure them by time to hardship, to let them gradually contend with temptation, and to allow them to behold the corruptions of mankind in miniature, before they encounter them in their bold and gigantic forms. An ardent and ingenuous youth, educated by parental solicitude in the seclusion of his domestic circle, accustomed "to muse on nature with a

poet's eye," and to listen to the rural sounds of a deep and sequestered solitude, the solemn voices he is used alone to hear, is in imminent danger when he enters into the bustle of life. The purity of his virtue is too glossy and too refined to endure the corruptions of society—the fairy frost-work melts away at the touch of evil, and he finds too late that his guileless artlessness is gone for ever. He has panted for the gaieties which are fluttering around him in exact proportion as they have been withheld from his gaze, and he has fancied them a thousand times more alluring than they are, because he has never seen them in their heartlessness and misery. The character of man never can be fixed or developed except in society. It is a very primary law of his nature which compels him to seek for companions of similar age, feelings and hopes with his own. In retirement, nothing but miserable and morbid sensibility can be engendered, which will prey upon the mind that nourishes it, or seek relief in an attachment to any object, however

unworthy of its regard. At a large school, on the contrary, the mind is accustomed to be assailed by degrees proportioned to its strength; it learns its own power by small and repeated victories, and the character acquires a strength, a solidity, and a firmness of decision which can alone repel the blandishments of vice, and actively diffuse happiness, freedom, and goodness among the improving ranks of our fellow beings.

But this is not the whole advantage to the moral feeling of a scholastic education. By the necessary effects of contact with a number of others moving nearly in the same sphere, that spirit of self-sacrifice, of willing accommodation, and of benevolence in trifles is elicited, which sheds a new charm over all the gifts of genius. And what is equally important, there is a manliness of feeling, a contempt of every thing that is mean, and a chivalrous sense of honor, kept perpetually alive by the constant occasions of its exercise. There is no scene in which those meannesses,

which laws cannot reach, which must be visited only by the contempt and indignation of society, are so narrowly watched and so justly punished with contempt as in a public school. A boy there finds himself subjected to the salutary control of the opinion of his fellows; he feels his moral responsibility to the circle in which he moves, and early acquires, from the necessities of his situation, a fixed and a decided character. He is no longer an insulated being who knows of none but those who fondle and caress him, he feels himself a member of a body corporate, and perpetually called upon for petty sacrifices and for active and generous exertions. Here he receives the germ of that public spirit which afterwards expands into warm and elevated patriotism. His glowing zeal for the honor of his class, of his party, and of his school, gives the first spring to that noble principle which it exhibits in beautiful miniature. Hence it is that all the genuine feelings of our ancient freedom are renovated and kept vigorous, and whilst the genius is

exercised and expanded, and the heart nourished and most delightfully stirred by indistinct hope and honorable ambition, new strength is added to the national cause, till the mind, extending still further in its progress, is filled with ardent, pure, and immortal benevolence for the whole class of beings in whose nature it participates. From the small and undulating circle in which it first moved, it derives a force and an impulse which to the very end of its existence shall "live, and glow, and kindle."

But the system pursued at most large schools, and the principle which gives life and ardor to them all, is exceedingly obnoxious to some of our opponents. Emulation, they contend, incites almost all the bad dispositions of youth—sets in motion the littleness of vanity, and the malignities of hatred, and thus improves the understanding to the injury of the more valuable qualities of the mind. What strange beings would these advocates of private education make the children they are

training up as models of perfection! They must be carefully shielded from every thing which may tend to excite their passions, they must not be agitated by fear or impelled by hope, they must never know what it is to contend manfully with their equals, they must pass their most ardent days of life in one dull scene of unvaried and unbroken repose. But in fact, the emulative feeling can never be wholly absent from the soul which is not absolutely detained in a forest or a cloister; and it will become more personal, more malignant and less improving, in proportion as it has fewer rivals to contend with. Many of our greatest characters, no doubt, while they call to mind the period when their powers were first developed by their ambition to excel their fellows; the fresh and bounding spirits with which they encountered the most laborious exertions; the inward workings of their anxious desires; the patience and firmness with which they persevered in the arduous struggle, and the transport with which at last

they succeeded, will feel not only that their progress in learning was greatly accelerated, but an energy imparted to them which has since become the master-spring of the most philanthropic and noble toils. That any advancement whatever can be made without emulation, will only be maintained in the wildest reveries of Madame de Stael, who actually fancies she has seen five hundred children never excited by either hope or fear, reward or punishment, making the most rapid advances in every kind of knowledge, from the influence of some inward and mysterious principle. In ONE public seminary of education at least, this very passion for excellence is rendered the means of calling forth the sweetest and most amiable charities of the heart. The reward of literary merit is conferred in the power of assisting others and of shielding them from the consequence of their own failure; and that principle, which in general is supposed to disunite and to tear asunder the bonds of kindness and of friendship, works in

all its modifications to cement all those who participate in its benefits by the tenderest and most lasting ties in firm and beautiful union.

School friendships Cowper considers as frail and unstable. It is probable that he spoke from his own limited experience. Certain it is, that attachments formed at that period of life are more likely to be sincere, than those by which we are influenced in later years. At all events, their effects upon youth are in the highest degree salutary and delightful. They call forth all the purest springs of tenderness in our nature with the force of the sweetest magic, they add grace to the generous enthusiasm of youth, and throw a beam of heavenly light on the fair morning of our days. Even when they have ceased to unite our hearts in delicious communion, they diffuse over the whole course of existence a calm and equable pleasure, to which we cling with more satisfaction as the days of its freshness recede from our view. Hence it is that amidst the loveliest endearments of disinterested affection

we feel what the noblest poet of our age has beautifully termed

> "The first mild touch of sympathy and love,
> "Whereby we find our kindred with a world,
> "Where want and sorrow are."

Let it not therefore be imagined that public education is favorable only to the manlier and more shining powers of our nature; there is no scene in which the heart is more nourished or the softer feelings more finely expanded. Even the disposition to cherish in meditation the more majestic and elevated powers of genius—those which retire into solitude from the gaze of ordinary mortals—may pass untouched through the bustle of a public school. It will not indeed be encouraged to an early display of its most sacred and pure resources; but the stream will become deeper and stronger in proportion as its channel is confined, and it is compelled to glide along unseen amidst the sequestered scenes of its own creation. It has a mighty object to engage it, which never can stir or refine it among the lulled retirements

on which it would desire to repose—the creation of a paradise of its own. Thus, to pass over a long and splendid list from the holy day-star of our church, the heaven-breathing Jeremy Taylor—we see three of the master spirits of the present times—men belonging to the old school of English poetry, and promising to revive its glories in new lustre, educated at one public school of immense size and of very inferior pretensions. Of these Mr. Leigh Hunt, better known indeed as a political writer of vehement and unfortunate invective, deserves a better and loftier fame from the elegance and point of his criticism—the enthusiasm with which he delights to seize on every flower in the path of life which can kindle the inspiration of his muse—the sportive and sometimes beautiful airiness of his fancy—and the cordial pleasure with which he luxuriates among scenes of lulled repose, and hangs over the sweet quiet and heart-touching pictures of domestic enjoyment. It is necessary only to mention in the second place, as

far higher in the scale of genius, the name of COLERIDGE—a writer whose powers are as various as they are noble; who has entered into all the sacred recesses of poetry, and, with the power of soaring to the loftiest flights, can throw around the lowliest and meanest objects a thousand charms of unvarying delight; who with a large portion of Shakespeare's magic, can penetrate into the inmost caverns of the heart and diffuse a horrible glare over the darkest and most mysterious of its workings, yet delights to expatiate in the wild solitudes of creation—to gaze on her peaceful fields in breathless rapture—and amidst the abodes of her lonely majesty to feel his kindred to sublimer orders of being. If depth of feeling merely be regarded, perhaps his friend Mr. CHARLES LAMB, who was contemporary with him at Christ's Hospital, is very little, if at all, his inferior. It is impossible to mention this gentleman without a fond regret that he writes so seldom. His singular and beautiful tragedy of John

Woodvil transports us again into the hallowed days of our English drama—exhibiting the same wildness of pathos, the same affecting mixture of the ludicrous with the distressful, and the same majestic simplicity, which characterise its noblest relics. But there is a tale from his pen, which, under the title of "ROSAMUND GREY," exhibits Clarissa Harlowe in the loveliest miniature—more sweetly simple, more true to nature, more scriptural and more enchanting, than any other composition of its length I ever had the happiness to peruse. There are several admirable essays too in the Reflector and Philanthropist which challenge admiration as the overflowings of his genius; but the production which most accords with our present subject is an essay on "Christ's Hospital, and the Character of the Boys," in the Gentleman's Magazine; —in which he hangs with a tearful rapture over the scenes of his childhood, and presents a more powerful argument to the heart in favor of Public Schools than all the

eloquence of Burke could supply. Here then is a most clear and decisive proof that an early mixture with youth in a large school is far from inimical to the progress of the deepest and the most retired genius, and that all its animation and bustle cannot disturb the glowing images which crowd on the inward eye of the mind. Such seminaries do not indeed send youth into the world with all the conceit and unfitness for real life, which mark the character formed in retirement—too refined for the grossness of active exertion, and too fond of solitary musings ever to be illustrious or useful. They are not calculated to form "men of feeling," bloated with sickly and morbid sensibility—selfish insulated beings, who live in a world of their own creation, and fancy themselves above all the ordinary restraints of morals and of opinion—fit heroes for the plays of Kotzebue or the novels of Godwin;[1] but warm and enlightened patriots,

[1] Let it not be imagined for a moment that I intend any disrespect to Mr. Godwin, by thus associating his

gentlemen endued with every chivalrous and honorable feeling, and christians disposed to veil the infirmities, to forgive the weakness, and to pity the vices, of their fellow-men. If

name with one of the most dangerous writers of Germany. It is precisely because his Fleetwood is a most exquisite and masterly delineation of a character, whose only fellowship has been with woods and mountains, that I have introduced it here as an illustration of my argument. There is scarcely any writer of modern date who possesses any semblance of his strong, dark, and powerful coloring, his vehement and impassioned eloquence, his glowing descriptions of lofty enthusiasm, and his bold and original conception. But the public became charmed with more lady-like and sparkling productions; and the genius of the author of Caleb Williams has fallen into neglect. None, I should imagine, who have read that wonderful romance, could ever forget the savage wildness of its coarser scenes, or the impatience with which they waited the developement of its mysteries. If Mr. Godwin would give such another work to the public, he would add a richer treasure to the stores of our national genius, than it is in the power of almost any other prose writer of the present age to confer.

gifted with higher powers and destined to move in a purer region, their deep and strong feeling will become deeper and stronger, and at all events they will learn those amiable charities and that generous openness of heart, which will rise above all that is despicable and vicious, and which, not content with avoiding evil, will, without preaching, teach mankind to despise it.

II. We have next to consider the influence of public schools on the interests of literature. And here it is first necessary to take notice of a plausible objection which has been raised more than once by the Edinburgh Review, not only against these institutions, but against classical learning itself—that it deprives the mighty of their strength, confounds the distinctions of nature, and destroys the fine bloom of genius. It would perhaps be sufficient to reply to the arguments adduced in support of this position, that the great object of education is not to raise men of brilliant powers, but to supply the world with useful members of its

great communion, ornamented with all that is tasteful and elegant in literature, and endowed with all that is honorable and generous in feeling. Our opponents, however, rightly think that if they could induce the public to believe that another Shakespeare lay buried beneath the dialectics of Aristotle, or that a "mute inglorious Milton" had been stifled in the bud by too large an acquaintance with Virgil, they would raise no small prejudice against those branches of learning, of which they are so anxious to deprive us. The truth, however, is that this applies, if at all, only to the very higher order of minds, whom no obstacles whatever could hinder from starting into life, and kindling a fame which can be obscured only by universal darkness. Can you restrain the "strong divinity of soul," by giving a little more Greek, or teaching a few moods and tenses? Had Shakespeare been intimately acquainted with the ancient tragedians, would he have produced nothing but miserable imitations, have sunk into a paltry

college pedant, and have reached the height of his ambition, if he could enjoy the applauses of a social party by a quotation happily applied from the Greek Anthology? Really the supposition is trifling in the extreme. The inward animating principle of the great spirits of the world lies too deep to be affected by any of those external circumstances, by which the minds of ordinary men acquire their character. Mighty poets have arisen from all possible conditions of life, and been endowed with almost all degrees of knowledge. Thus while our great dramatic bard burst from obscurity, simply invested with the divinity of his genius, our epic poet soared into all the glories of heaven, the confusion of chaos, and the horrors of the infernal abodes, endowed with all the rich and varied graces of classic erudition. As the first of our native spirits broke through all the miserable restraints of a theatre, compelled to please an audience more than half barbarians; and as the second arose unimpeded in his wildest ex-

cursions, by the regular graces with which he was encircled, so Richardson, the name almost equal in lustre, at a late period of life, rose superior to all the perplexing details of mercantile pursuit, and wielded the stormy and terrific passions, together with an exquisite and inimitable pathos, with all the vigor of a youth in the full bloom of untried genius. The printer of Salisbury Court was destined to present us with the most finished and perfect portraits of mortal excellence, with pictures of the most dissolving and heart-rending sorrow, and with a view of innocence meekly, and divinely triumphant, more touching, more noble, and more sublime, than ever was imagined in human language. Without, therefore, entering into the slightest examination of the arguments, which the ingenuity of the reviewers has adduced to prove the hostility of learning to originality of conception, it is sufficient to observe, that experience clearly proves the ability of the latter to break through every obstacle to its progress. The regions of

imagination yet contain wild, romantic, and unbounded tracts, wholly unexplored, and which future minds may reduce to their control. The successors of Homer had just as much right to declare all the ground occupied as the critics of the present times. The horizon of fancy is for ever extending, as we advance to those lofty and beautiful eminences in which we suppose the heavens and the earth to be united. Since, then, we may safely leave the minds which are possessed of unbounded resources to themselves, our attentions may be directed towards the interests of the great mass of our youth, without any regard to the bolder distinctions which nature has made among them. We may attend to the general cultivation of the soil, resting satisfied that her nobler productions, whose roots are far deeper than our efforts can penetrate in order to fertilise, will spring into maturity alike unimpeded by the barrenness of the ground, or the multitude of inferior plants which may be crowded beneath them.

It is not of so much importance what study first occupies the faculties, and incites the attention of a child, so that his faculties are employed and his attention aroused. But there are very few subjects which can so certainly effect this great object, as the study of the ancient languages. The memory, which at this season of life is usually very retentive, is called into active exercise, and the judgment and the reason are as truly engaged in applying the rules of grammar, as in the profoundest investigations of Algebra, and all the lighter powers, the fancy, the imagination, and the taste, are expanded and nourished by the perpetual bursting forth of new and inimitable beauties, while the delight experienced serves as a reward and a stimulus to the most laborious exertions. The youth is led through many difficult and arduous paths, into a world of splendors, which custom can never dim, where every vision that opens on his sight is consecrated by associations and images the most interesting and permanent. One moment he

feels himself transported into all the patriarchal simplicity of the age of Homer, enters with enthusiasm into the struggles, feelings, and sympathies of the heroes of Troy, burns with all the fury of a zealous partizan, mingles among the councils of the celestials, rages in the very thickest of the combat, or gazes with intense sympathy at the Trojan chief on the brink of destruction, kissing his unconscious, trembling boy, and wiping the tears from the downcast eyes of his lovely, and foreboding wife. The next he follows the retreat of the brave Ten Thousand, glows with all the ardor of the Spartans at Thermopylæ, or gazes with exquisite pleasure on the chaste loveliness of Athens, covered with the fresh laurels of Marathon. He listens with all the attention of the last spirits of the Athenian race, to the thunder of Demosthenes, walks through the hallowed groves with Socrates, Plato, and Xenophon, and lingers fondly over the last vestiges of Grecian freedom. Nor does the image of Rome, rising slowly and majestically

from the obscurity which has consecrated its birth, enkindle feelings less intense in their degree, or less vivid in their exercise. All her mighty names, from Brutus to Brutus, awaken an enthusiasm, which, like the fire of Prometheus, vivifies and expands all the energies of his mind, and kindles all the sympathies of his heart. And all this pleasure, pure and elevated as it is, may be rendered universal; it may be imparted to those, who are wholly incapable of the deeper and diviner ideas, which spring up in some favoured bosoms, from the primal affections of our nature. We may thus open a little Paradise, even amidst the desert. Nature herself will appear in fresher bloom to those who can fancy all her loveliest scenes peopled with superior beings. The country will seem to them enrobed in the lovely and luxuriant graces, with which it is adorned in the exquisite descriptions, or the matchless touches, of Theocritus, Virgil, or Horace. It is mind, and mind alone that contains within itself the "living fountains of all

that is beauteous and sublime, whether external objects derive their color, their loveliness, or their majesty, from the spontaneous thoughts of a heaven-born mind, and the noble aspirings of its divinity, or from the classic associations of ancient greatness. The great advantage, therefore, of this species of learning is, that it elevates those, who would otherwise grovel on the earth, to higher and brighter prospects, while it leaves unpolluted the purer and loftier regions of unearthly genius: add to this that it gives a key to all other kinds of knowledge. Mathematics, History, Legislation, and Moral Philosophy, will naturally follow an acquaintance with the people who gave them existence, and the languages in which they were first embodied. The more rugged and unpleasing sciences will be studied not merely for their dry practical results, but in their progress from birth to maturity, from the first rude traces in barbarous times to the degree of perfection to which they have arrived, and the color they have derived from the cha-

acter of nations, or the influence they have liffused through them. They will not be orced upon the attention in all the asperity with which those, who are wholly addicted to heir pursuit, have chosen to envelop them, but mellowed and softened by a thousand delightful remembrances, and glowing associations, and rendered mild and attractive by the beautiful medium through which we shall behold them. Thus too we shall trace out the fine and delicate windings of those bonds, by which all the objects of intellectual exertions are closely and mysteriously connected. We shall discover a clue to guide us through the intricacies of the Dædalian labyrinth, which will lead us to its loveliest and most sacred inclosures.

Now it will be admitted by all, that a Public School is the place where these advantages are to be acquired in their perfection. We may even venture to assert that it is the only place in which these studies will appear adorned with their fairest glories. The emu-

lative principle, to which we have before referred, gives an animation and a vitality to the scene, in which the ruggedness of the path is forgotten. The very ancient and venerable walls of those seats of learning, the recollection of the illustrious dead, who have there received the first rudiments of knowledge, and have burned with the same emotions, the glorious ambition of throwing a new lustre round the sacred battlements, are of themselves sufficient to kindle aspirations after excellence, which rise above the lower contentions for internal pre-eminence. But we are desired by the advocates of private education carefully to seclude our children from these incitements, as we would bid them shun a brood of asps and quicksands,[1] and to substitute in

[1] Say would'st thou, deaf to nature's tend'rest plea,
Turn him adrift upon a raging sea,
Or say, *go thither*, conscious that there lay
A brood of asps or quicksands in the way.
Thou would'st not—nature pulling at thy heart,
Condemns th' unfatherly, th' imprudent part,

their place a system whose chief merit is that it can never be reduced to practice. Let us nevertheless examine for a moment their fairy pictures of domestic instruction, and see if they will bear the slightest inspection of an unprejudiced and undazzled observer.

A parent, or a private tutor not immediately under the control of a parent, will naturally seek to form the mind of the boy under his tuition according to some mode which his fancy suggests, as supremely excellent. One will begin his course with the names of fluids, gases, and metals, and enforce all his precepts with an electric shock. Another will be anxious deeply to imbue the mind of his pupil with metaphysics and moral philosophy, and will form his capacities by teaching him how to measure them. A third will compel the child to *commit to memory* large portions of Euclid's elements and Bonnycastle's algebra,

> Then only govern'd by the self-same rule,
> Of *natural pity*, SEND HIM NOT TO SCHOOL.
>
> COWPER.

and send him star-gazing on the coldest nights of January, before he knows any thing of his native planet. A fourth, far more unreasonable than all the rest, will early furnish the soul with the intricacies of the Pelagian controversy, and without laying any tribute on his understanding, simply require him to believe all the exact articles to which Calvin assented, and will enforce his instructions with the threat of eternal damnation. The most fantastic shapes of a diseased imagination will be framed into systems of education, and those systems changed every day after dinner. It is really shocking to think that the time of youth should be frittered away by such ridiculous caprices. One man will fancy all the rules of grammar to be so many obstacles to the advancement of intellect,[1] and will exemplify his

[1] I have now lying before me a most curious work just published by Johnson, happily for the author, without any name, in which this position is not only gravely maintained, but its connexion is traced with all the innovations of the pure simplicity of nature, which

ı by his daily practice. Another will be
ıuadec by the Edinburgh Reviewers, that
ning is a tremendous obstacle to genius,
after throwing his son's Phædrus into the
send him to ruminate among the fields,
bid him seek the wildest and most ro-
ıtic solitudes, where he will probably make
first essay in plundering orchards and rob-
g birds' nests. But not to multiply the ex-
ɔles which crowd thickly upon us, it is
ugh to state the opinion of a man who in
ısic learning has few rivals, who certainly
ı far from being prejudiced in favor of any

ı have been disposed to regard as sacred. The title,
ch will speak for itself, is "*Reason the arbiter of
ıguage, Custom a Tyrant; or Intellect set free from
itrary authority.*" The force of ridicule is em-
yed in every page against the slavery of Rhetoric
Grammar, with an ingenuity worthy of a different
se. The reader will find there some of the strangest
aries of human intellect, of which the mind is capa-
, and a variety of observations on the whole circle of
sciences, which, though they will scarcely convince,
l not fail to amuse him.

established institutions, and who by the kindness and gentleness of his heart, formed a striking contrast to the asperities of his controversial writings. In several of his letters preserved in the memoir of him by Mr. Rutt, Gilbert Wakefield expressed his strong feelings on the subject of education, thus lamentably slurred over, bustled through, or frittered away into a thousand petty compartments. The system which small academies pursue, is liable to the same suspicion. In numerous flourishing seminaries of private instruction, the master is himself wholly ignorant of the most important branches of his duty. A merchant who fails in commercial speculation, prevails on his friends to assist him, by the sacrifice of their children, and assumes one of the most important offices of the state, that of an instructor of youth, as his last refuge from beggary. All his attentions are directed to increase the charges of his bill, to screw perquisites from tradesmen, and dexterously wring lucre from the comforts of his

pupils. But there is a bolder and more enterprizing class of instructors, advertising quacks in the profession, who pretend to understand all arts and sciences, but prove their acquaintance with none—but the art of puffing. One of these men discovers a new mode of teaching geography and astronomy by a hop-scotch, cuts his little play-ground into the shape of Europe, and "fairly lays the zodiac in the dust." Another establishes parliamentary debates, in which no one speaks but himself, and exhibits a fine garden in which none but the parents are ever admitted to parade. A fourth treats his friends every Christmas with a theatrical representation, in which nothing is correct but the murdering of the hero, and nothing tolerable but the fall of the curtain. At length some bold genius outshines them all, trumpets forth in bad grammar, that he has discovered a new and royal road to every human science:—fancies he can apply the Lancasterian system to every branch of literature—crams all Parnassus into nine lessons, each

containing all the efforts of a muse, throws all the books and pens out of the windows, and introduces original lessons, quantities of wetted sand, baskets, cradles, and caricatures in their room—dazzles the visitors with an everlasting profusion of pictures, toys and fripperies—blazes in the public papers, with reports of unprecedented success; and thus for a time delights the children with novelty, and their friends with brilliant anticipations; till the bubble bursts; the want of improvement can no longer be concealed, and the children return home with time lost, habits of idleness acquired, a fixed dislike to wholesome and solid instruction, and an unfitness for any honorable, generous, or manly exertions.

III. But the opponents of Public Schools, further contend that, be their remote effects what they may, they are scenes of present unhappiness; and that the years there spent in misery are no small portion of human existence. But the charge is altogether unfounded. The bounding hearts and the glistening and

ıl eyes of those who again survey the where they passed their boyhood, prove ılsehood more strongly than the most rful arguments. Happiness is not to be ated as if it were synonymous with quiet epose. The course, indeed, of a school- s somewhat more broken and uneven than of a child bred up wholly in the nursery; ts very difficulties and inequalities heighten pleasures with which it abounds. The ıt of knowledge may at first be obstinate steep, but the laborious exertions of a tra- r will be more than repaid by the goodli- of the prospects perpetually extending re him. All the little flutterings, anxieties, sorrows of a breast exulting with new-born , only serve to mellow and fertilize it, to e it feel its sympathy with distress, and to ish its sweetest charities. Nor is it true the separation of youth from their near tions tends, to diminish their affections to- ls them. On the contrary, it is often ne- ary, in order to prevent its languishing.

There is something in paternal love which counteracts its own efforts; it is perpetually demanding a mixture of awe and gratitude, which are directly opposite to that feeling of reciprocal tenderness, which alone will endure unchanged through all the varieties of existence. Amiable as it is, it frequently makes unreasonable demands on its objects, forgets the vast disparity of their years, and in order to promote their welfare, risks the loss of their regard. But when it delegates to others all the unwelcome parts of its duties, it appears only in its purest and most lovely forms. The images of every thing connected with home are sanctified in the heart of a boy, who *there* alone can meet with them. He looks forward to the time when he shall again behold them with intenseness of desire, he strains every nerve to deserve and to secure the esteem of his absent friends, and he beholds the approaches of the season, when all his acquirements will be exhibited, with a delight which none but he that has felt it can

nagine. There are no spots in the wilder-
ess of life more verdant, no sensations in the
hole range of human emotion more delicious,
o enthusiastic delight more tender and more
yous, than that which a youthful, generous
pirit feels on the commencement of the vaca-
on. Every glance is transport, every step
a spring, every thought is a joy. His heart
elevated above itself into a gay and airy
egion, in which every object is surrounded
ith a thousand celestial graces, so that he
lmost questions the realities of his joys, and
ancies himself wrapt in some enchanting vi-
on. He seeks, with breathless emotion, the
elds, the walks, the retirements, which ab-
ence has rendered sacred, sometimes pene-
rated with solemn awe, and at others thrilling
hrough every vein with mysterious delight.
Then he renews the friendships of his infancy,
atches the fine spirit of the morning in the
ompany of those over whose remembrance he
as brooded, and listens amidst the still and
ranquil repose of evening to the rural sounds,

which in his earlier years awaked the first kindling association in his bosom. And when we come to be engaged in all the bustle and anxieties of the world, and look back for a temporary refreshment on the lovely morning of our existence, the view will be more interesting and more vivid, if our path was diversified by some gentle undulations and varied by a succession of prospects. Instead of scanning at one glance the smooth and unbroken plain, we shall rest upon the little eminences which we once thought it laborious to ascend; we shall be perpetually enabled to pause on certain points of progress, and renew the sensations we experienced when the fresh prospect broke in upon us. Here, we shall say, we first had sight of such a beautiful and sequestered valley; here a new spring of living and pure water arose beneath our feet; there after an obstinate struggle we entered the deep woods consecrated to the Muses; and there, in a season of perfect serenity, the beams and glory of heaven shone around us.

We view the whole scene through the medium of a pure and tender enchantment; it seems to us, as we catch a momentary glance at its beauties through the long vista of turbulent years, like a region of fairy splendor. These sweet visions, we scarcely dare call them remembrances, burst in all the glory of heaven upon us "like angel visits short and far between."

A

DEFENCE

OF

PUBLIC EDUCATION,

ADDRESSED TO

THE MOST REVEREND

THE LORD BISHOP OF MEATH,

BY THE LATE

WILLIAM VINCENT, D. D.

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

In Answer to a Charge annexed to his Lordship's Discourse, preached at St. Paul's, on the Anniversary Meeting of the Charity Children, and published by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

THE THIRD EDITION.

1802.

LETTER

TO

THE MOST REVEREND

THE LORD BISHOP OF MEATH.

MY LORD,

INDISCRIMINATE charges are as abundant in mischief, as they are generally deficient in proof; and proof, in the business now to be discussed, your Lordship seems to have thought totally superfluous: without any knowledge of your own, without enquiry or examination, you assume the testimony of Dr. Rennell as incontrovertible; not reflecting, that if his evidence cannot be substantiated, your own accusation has nothing for its support. What ground Dr. Rennell had to charge the Masters

of Public Schools with neglect of Christian instruction, what right he had to assume the office of Censor, or how he brought himself to think, that he was more invulnerable than others of his profession, I know not. But, it is with regret, that I find his name introduced upon the present occasion, because I had entered into Articles of Peace with him two years ago, and had hoped that the subject in dispute had been quieted once for all. At that time, upon the interference of some common friends, Dr. Rennell was pleased to make an exception in favour of me, and the school under my superintendance; and though a private acknowledgment was no satisfaction for a public accusation, still I was easily reconciled, and acquiesced, under the opinion of friends, who certainly wished well to us both.

But if the testimony of Dr. Rennell is now to be revived, for the purpose of renewing the attack, it is not my intemperance, but the indiscretion of his admirers, that brings the question before the public in its present form. I

hope I shall not transgress the bounds of moderation; but I have a right to be heard in my own defence, a double right on the repetition of the charge, without any new offence on my part; and if I felt this charge as an injury from an equal, I feel it as oppression from a superior.

Perhaps, it will be asked, why I am so ready to stand forth before all other Conductors of Public Education? why my indignation is excited sooner than that of others implicated in the same charge of delinquency? I hope, my Lord, to make it appear, that I am not more irritable, but more injured; because my acquiescence, in the first instance, has only exposed me to a repetition of the affront. If any one pleads guilty, he may complain of want of generosity in his accuser, but he has no right to complain of his injustice. For my own part, I deny the fact; and many reasons urge me to stand upon my defence, which may weigh little with others in the same predicament.

The first is, that, like Solon's, my time of life is my security. In the course of nature, the period of my public labors cannot be remote; and the remuneration of my services, with which His Majesty has been pleased to honor me, has made me independent, whenever my own comfort or convenience induce me to fix the moment of my retirement. My mind may suffer, indeed, from injurious and unmerited reproach; but the talents and ingenuity of Dr. Rennell, and the eloquence of your Lordship, will be exerted in vain to prejudice me in my circumstances. You will both disclaim the intention. I speak not of your intention, but the fact; and the fact is, that if the world credits your assertions, in a very few years no man will be enabled to live by the emoluments of a Public School. It is in this point that I am superior to the utmost efforts of my accusers: and were I to retire to-morrow, I should lay down my office with a conscious satisfaction, in having closed the scene with a Defence of Public Education.

A second inducement for undertaking this office, is, that the reproaches of Dr. Rennell still remain unretracted and unexpiated; his private exception in my favour is of no value, if his public charge is still to mislead men of your Lordship's rank, consequence, and discernment. It is now revived after two years given to sooth it into oblivion, and may be repeated annually by every preacher called to the duty which your Lordship has performed; and if this charge should now be left unanswered, it may be deemed unanswerable.

But the cause, above all others, which compels me to disclaim all farther reserve, is the extensive circulation given to this reiterated attack, by means of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. The sanction of so venerable a body, added to the testimony of your Lordship and Dr. Rennell; the dispersion of the Annual Sermon in the Metropolis, in every county of England and Wales, extended likewise into Scotland, Ireland, Germany, and the East Indies, gives a celebrity and noto-

riety to this estimate of education in our great Schools, that all the abilities of Dr. Rennell, and all the address of your Lordship, could not have effected. Dr. Rennell, my Lord, has published many Sermons, and I question if his great name ever sold an edition of five hundred copies; but the Society prints three thousand; and, if we allow ten readers to a copy, here is an evil report propagated to thirty thousand persons, twice in the course of two years; which, if the event should be proportionate to the means, would leave all the Public Schools in the kingdom without a scholar.

Surely this was not the intention of Dr. Rennell, of your Lordship, or the Society. No.—But you intended our reformation and amendment.—Alas! my Lord, I am too old for reformation:—if I have not already done my duty without this admonition, I cannot now change my method, my habits, or my opinions;—but if the admonition was not wanted, (as I shall prove in the following pages), the mischief is the same: but where am I to look

for remedy or redress? The only hope of redress I had, was the interference of the Society. I applied for permission to circulate with their annual packet, containing your Lordship's Discourse, a Note, requesting the members to suspend their judgment on the point in question, till I could be heard in my own defence; but the Board was so prepossessed either of my delinquency, or Dr. Rennell's veracity, that my application was utterly in vain. Nothing can diminish my esteem and veneration for that excellent Society, which I have now attended for almost thirty years, with an affection that cannot be surpassed by the attachment of its best and warmest friends; but I feel something like a departure from its usual candour, in the present instance: for if a charge against any of its members is published under the sanction of the Society, and that charge should prove to be groundless, the injury is no longer that of the writer, but of the publisher; and if an action for defamation would lie in this case, I imagine it must be brought, not against

Dr. Rennell, but against the Secretary of the Society. That I harbour no such intention, your Lordship will readily believe; and the Secretary is so innocent of concerting any plan against me, or designing any evil by the publication, that he did not know the contents of the Discourse, till the morning it was laid before the Board, and many copies were in the hands of the members present. No, my Lord, the Secretary, with all his deference to your Lordship's rank, his attachment to your person, and his respect for your talents and abilities, had never been induced, by curiosity or duty, to read one word of your Sermon. It passed from your Lordship's hands into the Secretary's, and from the Secretary to the Printer: it returned from the Printer by sheets to your Lordship for correction; and when finished, it was committed to the Binder, with whom it continued till it was laid unread upon the table. Now, my Lord, suppose the accusation to be groundless; suppose the Sermon to have contained heterodoxy, or any thing

worse,—who was culpable?—not the Board, —for the Board never does see the Sermon; —not the Secretary, for he never looked at it; —not the Printer or Binder, for they will print or bind any thing that comes into their shop from the Secretary;—and yet, my Lord, with nobody responsible or accountable, this report of the Public Schools in England is to be propagated from the Liffey to the Ganges, as the opinion of the Society, adopted on the authority of Dr. Rennell and your Lordship. When I asked for the insertion of the Note for my own justification in the packet, I did not ask for the opinion of the Board.—I was to defend myself; and till that defence could be prepared, I requested only not to be prejudged by the sanction and publication of so venerable a body. Festus thought it unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him. I desired only the converse of this proposition, that my crimes should not be signified, without giving intimation at the same time that I was ready for my

trial. I should have obtained this request from a Roman and a Gentile.

It is with infinite regret that I am compelled to allude to any transaction in a Society, which I respect above all others, for doing the most extensive good with the least possible parade; and I repeat, that it is with much concern I am compelled to recur to Dr. Rennell's Discourse. But it is for your Lordship's information upon that point, that I must state the following particulars. When some members of the Board interfered to effect a reconciliation between Dr. Rennell and myself, I no sooner received his letter, with the exception in my favor, than I returned an answer by the same post, expressed in cordial terms, that I was contented to be silent. I was not a little surprized to find afterwards, that another letter was written by Dr. Rennell to the Board, much less favourable to me, and much more resolute in censuring Public Schools and Universities, than even his publication. I repented of my acquiescence, but my word was pas-

sed, and I made no further complaint. Dr. Rennell will feel the value of this sort of moderation, when I acquaint him that my Defence was ready for publication, and could have gone to the press the next morning. An Author who can stop at such a point, can hardly be deemed irritable or implacable; but these facts it is now necessary to state, because your Lordship must have been unacquainted with them, or else you could not have grounded your own charge on the public testimony of Dr. Rennell, had you known his retraction in private. The express words of your accusation are these:—

"I had proposed to say a few words on the sad degeneracy of our Public Schools, in this most important part of education, and their systematic neglect of that religious instruction which in the earlier partsof the Reformation, and even to a much later date, was so carefully provided for the higher and wealthier classes of the British youth; but I found the subject anticipated by Dr. Rennell, in his Sermon on

this anniversary, and I could add nothing to what that zealous and eloquent preacher had there urged, to call the public attention to this portentous evil."—Note p. 39.

Surely, my Lord, "degeneracy," "systematic neglect of religious instruction," and "portentous evil," are terms harsh enough for the most zealous and eloquent preacher in Christendom to adopt.—They could want no addition from your Lordship, if they are Dr. Rennell's language; and they cannot well be carried higher by any future eloquent preacher, if they are your Lordship's. You, my Lord, make no exception, because you were unacquainted with Dr. Rennell's exception; and thus, all the conductors of public education are comprized in one general indiscriminate charge, without a single qualifying clause in favor of any one.

But gross as this language is, there is nothing except the charge of systematic neglect of religious instruction, to prevent my arguing the question with the most perfect composure:

that, indeed, is a crime of such a nature, that if it can be brought home and proved against me, or any master, no punishment can be too great. Neglect there is in all education, arising from the infirmity of human nature, and the tedium of treading the same dull round daily through a life of perpetual labor, confinement, and anxiety. Evils there are in all public education, produced by the habits and customs of the place, which can no more be eradicated out of schools than nations. Evils there are from the temper, habits, and manners of the times; and evils there are in the constitution and statutes; for our ancestors, though wise, were not perfect; and vice there is, wherever three hundred human beings are collected into a body. All this, therefore, I would have conceded; and on this, I imagine, your Lordship's complaint is not founded. But the *systematic* neglect of religious instruction is a crime of the blackest dye: and I reserve my observations on the indiscretion and intemperance of my accusers, till I have proved the imputation to be a falsehood.

False I call it in direct terms; and calumnious I would have called it, but that to constitute calumny, I must prove that the intention of the accuser was malicious, and that his malice was founded upon what he knew to be a falsehood himself. Of this I acquit both Dr. Rennell and your Lordship; but I believe that the zeal of Dr. Rennell made him conceive that this was a splendid topic for his eloquence, and that your Lordship mistook rhetoric for argument, or assertion for truth; but in this instance, my Lord, you have gone a step beyond the information of your brief. Dr. Rennell confined himself to the term "*many*," but you comprehend all Public Schools in general, and condemn all in one sweeping clause for degeneracy and systematic neglect.

But let us first settle the terms of the controversy, and the extent of the charge. What does Dr. Rennell, or your Lordship, comprize under the expression of Public Schools? Are we to understand only Winchester, Eton,

and Westminster? or, are we to extend our notion as we ought to do, to the three other great schools in the Metropolis; to Harrow, Rugby, Manchester, Wakefield, and many more of equal magnitude in the North? If all these are to plead guilty to the charge, the rising generation is ripe for the machinations of a Voltaire, a Diderot, a d'Alembert, a Condorcet, or a Lepaux; and we may expect a revolution in Church and State, as soon as ever a prime agitator shall start up in this country to set the conspiracy in motion. I do not think, my Lord, that either you or Dr. Rennell carry your impeachment to this extent. If you do, I must maintain that your enquiries and your information will not bear you out in the event; for even in the three schools, which I suppose your accusations in reality to comprehend, your investigation is miserably deficient. Dr. Rennell was bred at Eton, and has lived at Winchester; but he knows no more of Westminster than Tom Paine does of the Bible. Just enough to misrepresent and condemn, but

nothing to qualify him for a judge of what is excellent and good. But he does not include Westminster. No.—Not in his private judgment: but his Sermon is still sufficient to mislead your Lordship, and to influence the opinion of the public. If the attack is made in concert, it is overwhelming me with your united talents and abilities: if you have not consulted him, you have built upon a foundation which he has renounced.

What sense the Warden and Master of Winchester, or the Master of Eton, may have of this procedure, I know not; but they are men of abilities, and equal to their own defence. I have not communicated with them, because I had not the arrogance to offer myself as a champion in the common cause; neither ought their interests, or estimation in the world, to be hazarded on my Defence, if it should prove inadequate to its purpose. Winchester I know enough of, generally, to believe that the accusation is groundless: and who is it that accuses Eton? a man bred un-

der the protection of the pious Founder, whose abilities have been nurtured and expanded under his roof,—those abilities which are now employed to depreciate his establishment. We have among us a piety and a gratitude to our nursing mother; faults she has, which we rather dissemble than expose; and if one of her sons had acted in a similar manner, we should have disowned him as an alien. Dr. Rennell's character stands high in the world as a man of virtue, morality, and religion; those of a similar description whom we have bred, are generally our firmest friends through life, and our system is reprobated only by those who never profited by their education.

Thus far I have proceeded on the general grounds of the accusation. I shall now enter upon the specific heads of the charge; for which, however unwillingly, I must of necessity recur to Dr. Rennell's discourse, because your Lordship has not descended to particulars. The specific charges may be reduced to three heads.

I. That a preference is due to the religious education in Charity Schools, compared with the instruction in Public Seminaries.

II. That the Paganism taught in Public Schools, is noxious to the cause of Christianity: and,

III. That Public Schools are guilty of a systematic neglect of all religious instruction.

1st. The first head of the charge is comprized in the following terms:

"Another circumstance of the times, which render the labors of the Society of peculiar exigency, is the most lamentable and notorious defectiveness of Christian education in many of our Public Schools, and other great Seminaries of this nation." . . . . . "All who are acquainted with the elementary ignorance of Christianity, in which young men are permitted to remain in the greater part of our Public Institutions, (and it is impossible to be much conversant in them without knowing this) will see how necessary the exertions of this Society are, for preserving the light of the

Gospel among the lower ranks of men. . . . . The charitable hand which supplies the deficiency among the poor, is peculiarly grateful to God and beneficial to mankind." See Dr. Rennell's Sermon, p. 7, before the Society, 1799.

This is the language of the Preacher; and in order to inform us, that *by the other great seminaries of the nation*, he designates the two Universities, he uses in his note, A, the expression of *young men in this situation*; a term exclusively appropriate to those learned bodies.

Here then we are to learn, that the *defectiveness* of religious education in Public Schools, and the Universities, can only be counterbalanced by preserving the light of the Gospel among the lower ranks; and if the light of the Gospel were extinguished in the higher Seminaries, every minister of the Gospel, who knows his duty, would unite with Dr. Rennell, in turning from the reprobate, and preaching to the poor, who would receive the glad

tidings of pardon and redemption. But this is the fact to be proved, and Dr. Rennell has not proved it. When we look to the press of the two Universities for the last thirty years, we find greater treasures of Theology issuing from that source, than in any period of equal length since the Reformation; and if it shall be said, that there are a few learned in that science still remaining, but who pay little attention to the rising generation,—where did those that *are* learned acquire their knowledge? and what is the reason, that, previous to Dr. Rennell's animadversion, and without waiting for his advice, lectures in Divinity were given in both those Seminaries? lectures requiring so indispensable an attendance, that no Bishop will ordain a candidate without a certificate from the Professor, that this duty has been fulfilled.

This is a subject foreign to my purpose: the Universities are not deficient in those who are qualified to meet Dr. Rennell on any ground; and whenever his efforts shall be deemed noxious rather than intemperate,

instead of one correspondent he will have twenty.

But in Public Schools, wherein does this lamentable and notorious *defectiveness* consist? and why is a preference given to the Teachers of Charity Schools rather than to the Instructors in a higher sphere? Could not a popular audience be sufficiently flattered without levelling all above them? Could not the educators of the lowest be consoled under their laborious duty, without detracting from those whom the public voice, and the discernment of their nominators or electors had appointed to the management of the first Seminaries in the kingdom? Are not these men of the same profession as their accuser? And does Dr. Rennell deny faith and ability to every Churchman but himself?—No, not ability but will; *that* shall be answered in its place. But why are men bred to the instruction of youth by an apprenticeship, supposed more willing to execute their trust than those who have received the most liberal education

known in Europe? This is no vain-glorious boast. Foreigners subscribe to it; they allow the palm of general information to English travellers above all others. Where did they acquire it? In English Schools, in English Universities; and in nineteen instances out of twenty from the English Clergy. Why are these foundations to be decried? Why are these men to be degraded by a comparison with those who have never had similar means of acquiring knowledge, or equal advantages in life, manners, and education? But this is not sufficient; the inferior is to be raised above the superior; the children of the poor are to be told, that they have better instruction than those above them; and the teachers of the poor are taught to believe, that their's is the pre-eminence; that they are to atone for the neglect, and compensate for the deficiency of all that are engaged in the education of the higher orders. If the children who heard this discourse understood it, I should imagine, that their respect for the rank above

them must be greatly diminished, and their resistance to subordination greatly increased; and if they were capable of drawing a conclusion, the natural consequence ought to be, that, as they are wiser and better than their superiors, they ought to govern, and their superiors obey.

As to the masters who are to instruct the poor, a more useful order of men in their rank can hardly be supposed; and of the few known personally to me, I have had reason to judge well. The master who presides in the school with which Dr. Rennell and myself are connected, as Rectors of adjoining parishes, is a sober, discreet, and laborious teacher; he officiates likewise as my parish clerk. If we suppose this good man to have listened with attention to Dr. Rennell's discourse, what must be his opinion of his Rector? It could be no other than this—that he was master of a Public Seminary, indeed, but totally disqualified either by want of will or ability, to give the youth under his care the same religious

instruction as the children of the poor received in the parish school. But *was* this good man misled by Dr. Rennell's information?—No. He would think himself as little qualified to instruct me in the art of teaching, as to correct, by an harangue from the desk, the abominable doctrines which I was delivering in the pulpit.

The eloquence of Dr. Rennell on this subject, animated by his zeal, could not fail to impress the audience with an opinion, that he was a more strenuous advocate for this system of education, than all who had preceded, or should follow him in the same office. But if this is the idea of his general patronage and protection, let us enquire how it stands in regard to its specific application? For if there should be two Rectors of contiguous parishes, connected with the same school, and one of these Rectors should, in the course of twenty years, have preached in favour of the institution almost annually, while the other had afforded his assistance only once. If one should have taken a part in the management, while

the other never attended a single meeting;—if one should have given his countenance to the master, encouraged him in his labours, and consoled him under his difficulties, while the other hardly knew his name or his person;—if one should have catechised the children, while the other never asked them a question;—if one should have expounded the catechism, either privately or publicly, almost every year, while the other never condescended to so humble an office—we will leave it to the judgment of the public, which of the two was the greater advocate for the general system? and which of the two was the more zealous supporter of the school under their common protection?

It is not meant to detract from the services of Dr. Rennell at St. Paul's: they were important and meritorious; but he ought not to arrogate all merit to himself: he ought not to assume a right of censuring every other species of education, but the one he was to recommend: he ought not to have flattered the poor at the expence of the rich: he ought not to

have elated the poor above their condition, by enhancing the value of their acquirements, and depreciating those of every other order in society: he ought not to have told the instructors of these children, that they were more able, or at least more willing, to do their duty than his brethren of the Clergy, who were engaged in the higher departments, and the more arduous office of educating the children of the wealthy and the noble. Our service is sufficiently painful in itself: why is our estimation to be lessened in the eyes of the people, by the intemperance of a man who thinks he has no equal among his equals? If we do not fulfil our duty, we are amenable; but not before the tribunal of Dr. Rennell. He is not yet my Diocesan or my Principal, and I am thankful that he is neither.

II. The second charge brought against Public Education, is this:

"There is scarcely an internal danger which we fear, but what is to be ascribed to a *Pagan* education, under Christian establishments, in

a Christian country." See Dr. Rennell's Sermon, note (*A*) p. 18.

To enforce this assertion, Dr. Rennell adduces the authority of Mr. Jones, in a publication called Considerations on the Religious Worship of the Heathen. Here, my Lord, I must speak in very plain terms. I appeal to your candour, to your liberality as a man, and your charity as a Christian, to judge definitively between Dr. Rennell and myself; whether the introduction of Mr. Jones's name on this occasion, does or does not point the charge to me, exclusively of all the masters of the Public Schools? Dr. Rennell has denied this, and does deny it in his letter to me. If I acquiesced in his denial; if I do not now charge him with an intention that ought never to be imputed to a man after his assertion to the contrary, I acquiesce in charity; but I leave the judgment to your Lordship.

There is a circumstance which I conclude is totally unknown to your Lordship, and it is this: Mr. Jones's Tract, in question, was ad-

dressed personally to me in the advertisement, and in the title-page. And if so, whom did Dr. Rennell address when he charged Public Schools with the crime of teaching PAGANISM,[1] rather than Christianity? Speak candidly, my Lord. If you say I am not the person designed, I will submit to your judgment. If you say I am, what must be your opinion of Dr. Rennell, the guide you have followed, the oracle you have believed? I abide by your decision, without any appeal to the opinion of the public; for I will argue the question as if I admitted Dr. Rennell's assertion, that I am not the person charged with the offence.

The first point I have to complain of, is, that the reading of Pagan Authors is converted into a Pagan Education; a perversion of terms that conceals a fallacy under a most invidious assumption. For who is a disciple of Fo, because he learns Chinese? or a Bhuddist, because he reads Sanskreet? If the wild mytho-

[1] The word is in capitals, in Dr. Rennell's Note, A.

logy of Hindostan is thought an object worthy the labours of a Sir W. Jones, a Wilkins, or a Maurice, to explore; if some men of the most consummate learning have dedicated their lives to investigate the extravagances of the Egyptian, Persian, Peruvian, or Druidical system; does it follow that they are tainted with the respective superstitions?—but it will be said these are men, and we teach children; be it so. Yet I assert, that I never yet found a child of ten years old, who believed in the transformation of Jupiter into a bull, or a swan, or a shower of gold; nor a child, in the nursery, convinced that crows sung, or trees talked, or asses played on the fiddle. The scruples of Dr. Rennell, after banishing the abominable heathen Poets out of our schools, may wish to discard Æsop and Pilpay from our families. He has read Rousseau,—Rousseau complains, that in La Fontaine, foxes lie; and his *eléve* must not suspect that there is such a thing as a lie in the world. Sweet innocence! he will find plenty of lies, and falsehood, and decep-

tion too, when he shall enter upon the scene of life; and perhaps it were better that he should learn the distinction in theory, before he suffers from them by experience. But children of five years old are not deceived by fables, more than by the parables in scripture. If Jotham makes a bramble talk, why may not Æsop? And children of ten, are no more misled by the Gods of Ovid, than men are by the miracles of Apollonius or Creeshna.

I stated these sentiments in a letter to Mr. Jones, upon the publication of his Tract; and I explained to him the course of our religious instruction at Westminster. His answer I have in my possession, dictated by himself, but written by a friend. For, alas! his hand was no longer able to wield that pen, which he had employed so often, and so ably in the cause of Religion. He admits my exculpation; he approves of the propriety and consistency of our plan; he exhorts me to pursue it: and I reflect with pleasure that he cheered my labours with his blessing, not many days

before he was himself to be received into the habitation of the blessed.

The plan, my Lord, of our human, moral, and religious instruction, is not mine; it is in our statutes. I am accountable for nothing but the execution of it. I am not authorised, if I were willing, to substitute Prudentius for Virgil, or Gregory Nazianzen for Homer: but I have not the will more than the power; for our authors are not intended to teach Paganism, but to set before our youth the best models of writing that the world affords. Whither shall we go for these, but to the Romans, or to the Greeks, who were *their* masters, as well as ours? and, Pagans as they were, these masters were not ignorant of the moral duties contained in the second table of the Decalogue: for we learn from Sophocles, that they acknowledged the

ἄγραπτα, κᾳ' σφαλῆ θεῶν
Νόμμα . . . . . .
Οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κᾳ' χθὲς, ἀλλ' ἀεί ποτε
Ζῇ ταῦτα, κοὐδεὶς οἶδεν, ἐξ ὅτου φάνη.

Antigone, l. 455.

And we are taught by the Hymn of Cleanthes, that in regard to the contents of the first table, they were not utterly in the dark.

The use that has been made of that extraordinary composition on the Continent, is no reason for excluding it from a Christian Seminary: it is the application of it, by the teacher, that may pervert it to a bad end; but there is no danger in shewing, that the Heathens in the midst of darkness retained some knowledge of the origin of evil; that some among them rejected the Epicurean doctrine of fate and chance; or that others did not place the first happiness of life in pleasure.[1] When we have such authors as these in our hands, if a master

[1] Young men place their happiness in pleasure, and are soon compelled to own that all is vanity and vexation of spirit; those of riper years are taught that the first happiness of life is in their knowledge of God and of his agency. The second is, where Aristotle has placed the first, in the contemplation of the mind itself, in the acquirements it has made, and the information it possesses.

does not explain the sentiment of Sophocles by the text of St. Paul, and contrast the eternal unwritten law of the Gentiles, with *the law engraven on the heart;* if he does not compare the language of Cleanthes, Plato, Socrates and the Stoic school, with the doctrines of Revelation; if he does not point out how far those doctrines approach the truth, and how infinitely they fall short of the Word of God, that master is not of our stock, nor worthy of the place he holds. Upon such opportunities as authors or sentiments like these afford, I remember to this hour, the tone, the manner, the elevated warmth of my own preceptor, the venerable Metropolitan of York; and I feel at this moment, that I owe the firmest principles of my mind, and my first reverence of the Scriptures, to his instruction.

You will think, my Lord, perhaps, that I catch at a splendid example of good, to hide the deformities of the bad; that I suppress the ignorance of Pagan Poets and Histo-

rians, to take refuge under the more enlightened discoveries of Philosophers; but I do aver once more, that I never found a child in the lower forms ideot enough to want guarding against the seduction of his mind by the Gods or Metamorphoses of Ovid; or one advanced into the higher classes, who could not relish the sarcasm of Elijah, when applied to the Gods of Homer. "Cry aloud; for he is a God! either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey: or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." These are the admonitions which our daily duty affords us opportunity to enforce; and the bitterness of an adversary dare not assert, that when we have Homer in our hands, our reverence for the Poet makes us forget our religious obligations.

Mr. Jones, with as sincere a faith as ever adorned a Christian, undoubtedly had prepossessions of this sort. The circumstances of the times operated more powerfully on his mind, than on others who were possessed of less fer-

vency and zeal. He had lived to see the Christian religion overwhelmed in France, and altars erected to Liberty, and Reason, and Nature, and Nonsense. He saw the grossness of Heathenism, as he thought, reviving in the caprice of imagination, and he wished to warn his own countrymen against a similar catastrophe. Had he lived to the present moment his apprehensions might have been diminished; he might have been convinced that no such evil would have arisen here from a classical education; and that it did not spring in France from any such source, but from a philosophy that detested solid instruction next to the religion of the Gospel;—from a faction, that by a civic education meant ignorance and barbarism;—from a fanatic groupe of the illuminated, who replaced the professors discarded from the college of Louis le Grand by a corporal of the guards.

But if Mr. Jones was misled by his apprehensions, his language was calm, temperate, and friendly; he neither overcharged the co-

louring, nor perverted the terms. Dr. Rennell has done both. By substituting *Pagan* for *Classical* education, he cajoled all those who were ignorant enough not to know the distinction between reading Pagan authors, and teaching the Pagan religion; and thus he made a second appeal from the learned to the ignorant: to the ignorant, I say, because there is not an individual in the nation, of a rank to have partaken of a Classical education, who could have been deceived by the fallacy for a moment. The luminaries of the Church in all ages, from Bede to Roger Bacon, from Bacon to the Reformation, and from the Reformation to the present hour, were all formed upon classical instruction. And if the writings of our English Divines stood higher than all others in the estimation of Europe, for solidity of reasoning, and superiority of composition, what other cause can be assigned for it, but the excellence of the models by which their style was formed and their judgment corrected? And if we are now forbidden to have recourse

to the same means of information, it is one step towards the re-establishment of the *imprimatur* of our own country, or the *index expurgatorius* of the Inquisition. We know that Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerom were as well versed in the elegancies of classical literature, as in the sublime language and important truths of the Scripture. And we know that Tillotson, Pearson, Butler, and Sherlock, were all trained under this execrable Pagan Institution, which is continued in our schools, both public and private, to the present hour. Are all who read the Koran disposed to become Mahometans? All who read Iamblichus, Mysticks? or all who read Manetho, Astrologers? These, indeed, are depths of corruption which we do not fathom; but we assert, that our pupils are no more liable to delusion from the miracles of Livy, or the oracles of Herodotus, than men are from these seductions of deeper research. In History and Oratory, the Gods are not *always* presented to our contemplation; in Poetry, the finest

passages are not dependent on mythology; but it is the composition itself, the style, the diction, the manner, the sublimity, the perfection of the model that is ever before our eyes, ever present to our mind, ever instructing and forming our understanding, and ever stimulating us to a desire of equal excellence or competition. Whenever those who decry classical instruction shall produce us works more worthy of imitation than those of the ancients, we will leave the inferior models for the better; but if ever the human intellect was cultivated to the extent of its powers, if ever the arts were carried to the summit of perfection, if ever generous competition effected more than the thirst of gain, it was in Greece; and if the treasures of Greece, because they are Pagan, are now to be hidden from the British youth, they will be replaced, not by a religious, but by a civic education, and barbarism in its rudest form. All knowledge, all letters, arts and sciences may be misemployed; but it is notorious false reasoning to argue

from the abuse of any good against its use; and all the eloquence of Dr. Rennell will never prove, that more evil is derived from Greek literature than good. *Whence* was the eloquence he employs to decry these wicked Pagans derived, but from a Pagan source? From his knowledge of the Ancients, from his contemplation of Demosthenes or Cicero? Perhaps he has been misled by the *divine* Philippic of the Roman, and mistaken Obloquy for Rhetoric; perhaps it was congenial to his talents to copy rather the railing accusation of the Orator against Antony, than his eulogy of Cesar.

But *where* did Dr. Rennell acquire that knowledge, which, in your Lordship's opinion, constitutes him the most eloquent preacher of the age?—At Eton. *Where* is Dr. Rennell's son training up to the same degree of eminence?—At Eton. And why is the family of the Rennells alone to escape the contagion of these Pagan principles, while thousands bred in the same celebrated Seminary are all tainted with the infection?

But I have done with this article of the impeachment. I had intended to close it with an answer to some of the more general reflections on Public Education, by Milton, Cowley, and Addison: but a few words must suffice.

Milton complained of the years that were wasted in teaching the dead languages, and proposed a more compendious method of his own; but Johnson, who had taught these languages himself, observes, that no man can teach faster than a boy can learn. We know nothing of Milton's success: for not a name of all his pupils is upon record: but we know that the brightest luminaries of the age issued from the school of Busby; and we know that to form the habits of literature, time is required as well as teaching.

Cowley complained that classical education taught *words* only, and not *things*; but it ought to be considered, that all the instruction of childhood depends more on memory than intellect. When the age of comprehension

omes, from twelve or fourteen to sixteen or eighteen, if the master teaches only words, he is a blockhead. It is the composition of the Poet he is to notice, and not the rendering a word of the original by its correspondent term in English; the order, connexion, and relation of part to part, the allusions to History, Mythology, and Geography; and if these are not things rather than words, where are we to search for them?

Addison deemed it an inexpiable error, that boys with genius or without, were all to be bred Poets indiscriminately; and if this were our object in teaching prosody, his reproof would be just; but no ear can be formed to harmony, no Poet can be read with pleasure, no intimate acquaintance with any dead language can be obtained, without a knowledge of prosody. Greek is less understood than Latin, because the compositions in that language are less frequent; and Hebrew is less understood than either, because no one composes in it at all. But will not prose compo-

sition answer the purpose as well as verse?—No teacher will think so who has tried the experiment; and the practice of all schools proves, that prosody is never neglected, unless where the master is ignorant of it himself.

I have much more to say in answer to these several objections, but they are foreign to the immediate purpose of my Defence; and I shall proceed immediately to the consideration of the last article exhibited against Public Education, by your Lordship and Dr. Rennell. The recital must be dull, but it shall be true.

III. In the Note to Dr. Rennell's Sermon, the charge stands thus:

"We cannot but lament that in *very few* of our best endowed Seminaries, the study of Christianity has that portion of time and regard allotted to it, which the welfare of society, the progress of delusive and ruinous errors, and the true interest of sound learning itself, seems at the present time *peculiarly* to call for. In *some* of them, and those not of *small* celebrity or importance, *all* consideration of the revealed

will of God is passed over with a resolute, systematic, and contemptuous neglect, which is not exceeded in that which the French call their *National Institute*." See Dr. Rennell's Sermon, note (A) p. 18.

Dr. Rennell, by the terms "some," and "very few," leaves an opening for exception, as has been already acknowledged; but when you, my Lord, adopt his expression of systematic neglect and apply it to Public Schools in general, without discrimination or qualification, Dr. Rennell is still accountable for the error into which he has led your Lordship; and your Lordship accountable for the evil report which you have published to the world, without sufficient authority or examination. The same outcry, my Lord, is to be found in several of our religious and moral writers of the present day,—in Cowper, in Dr. Randolph of Bath, in Mr. Gisborne, and Mrs. Trimmer: and the Secretary of the Society informs me very coldly, that he is little acquainted with Public Schools, but he has

similar reports. This from a friend, my Lord, was a reproach more severe than from an adversary; a friend, my Lord, who had written the letter dictated by Mr. Jones; who had read the exculpation which I sent to that excellent divine; and who, by his present answer to my application, gives me reason to think, that he either did not remember my Defence, or did not believe one word of it. I felt this as the reproof of a friend, and I am still in friendship with him; for he is a good man, and an admirable secretary; but if his opinion, or influence, have at all contributed to promote the rejection of my request, by the Board, I shall feel that our excellent Society, like many others, is rather too much under the direction of its officers.

These, however, are incidental circumstances; and I now proceed to my Defence.

It would appear, from the imputations of your Lordship, and Dr. Rennell, as if you were both ignorant, that every Collegiate foundation has a book of statutes, and that the

statutes of all these foundations are very full and express on the enforcing of religious duties, and attendances on the offices of worship. What the ordinances in other instances may be, I know not; but the religious offices at Westminster, prescribed by our statutes, amount to prayers (including the graces) ten times a day: of these none are actually omitted,[1] except the prayers at six o'clock in the morning: the majority of the others is performed regularly from five to nine times every day, when we attend school twice, with a remission on one day only in the week; for this neglect, which is confessed, I must expect your Lordship's reprehension; but the world, in general, will perhaps think that the

[1] The omission of early prayers in this and other foundations, has arisen from the manners of the age; those who are not in bed early, cannot rise early. Our ancestors retired with the curfew; and yet Matthew Paris complains, that, in performing the *Anti-lucan* service, the Monks of his Abbey (St. Alban's) were asleep, and the reader was unintelligible from dispatch.

office is still too frequent. The performance of this service is generally enforced with as much external decency as can be exacted, allowing for the natural impatience of boys under restraint, and the levity of youth. The Latin prayers at six in the morning, and eight in the evening; with the English at twelve and five, comprehend nearly the whole service of the Church. These, so far as they are performed, are performed with all the propriety which the presence and authority of the master can effect; the others are brief and momentary; but in the execution of this duty, the second master, on three days in a week, at least, is often nine times personally present.

If it shall be asked, what effect this service has upon the morals of our youth; for the present I shall answer, that the habit of prayer is a good habit. I am now only contending against the resolute and contemptuous neglect of our duty with which we are charged; and I maintain, that whatever the effect may be,

here is a *resolute* and *persevering* attendance on the offices prescribed.

The next object of our statutes is to put the Scriptures into the hands of our scholars, from the day on which they enter the School, to the day they leave it: they commence with translating the Psalms almost daily; they proceed to the Gospels; then to a collection of Sacred Exercises, appropriate to the School; and finally, to produce a composition in verse, from the Psalms, every Monday. This is the business of the lower School. In the higher classes, the Sacred Exercise is still used for compositions in verse, the Greek Testament, Grotius, and the Hebrew Psalms, and throughout the year, on Saturday, a History, or other portion out of the Scriptures, is appointed for a Bible exercise in verse: added to this, the Catechism, or Bishop Williams's exposition, is as regularly repeated on Monday morning, in the lower forms, as in a Parish School; attended with such an oral explanation as might instruct the Parish Teacher, as well as those

he teaches. In the higher classes there is another sort of Religious Instruction, which shall be noticed in its proper place.

Such, my Lord, is the Institution that Dr. Rennell calls a Pagan system; and such are the labors of men, that he accuses of resolute, contemptuous, and systematic neglect of Christian Instruction. But in all this, my Lord, we claim no merit; it is the routine of business, the prescription of our statutes: whether any effect follows from it or not, we have performed a duty, we have fulfilled our covenant, and we are no farther accountable to man. If we have any merit, it is in the execution of voluntary and higher offices; but these, your Lordship and Dr. Rennell have no right to exact, nor the World, nor the Parents of the children entrusted to our care; we contracted only for this, and this we have performed. I have performed it for forty years; from the day I sat as Usher at the first form, to the present moment in which I am writing. I acknowledge no delinquency or neglect; and if any can be

proved against me, I ask for no favor, but let judgment be passed.

So much for the resolute and contemptuous, but I come now to the systematic neglect: an imputation of your Lordship's, in common with Dr. Rennell. Now, this charge will fall to the ground of itself, if it can be proved, that, in any one instance, we do more than what the letter of our statutes enjoins. The instances I produce are these: First, The exposition of the Catechism; and, Secondly, The application of every passage in Scripture to instruction, as soon as our Pupils are of an age to comprehend. If there is a single lesson of the Greek Testament, where the opportunity for this is not embraced; if there is a single exercise out of the Bible, proposed or explained to the Classes, without this object in view; without considering the moral and religious tendency of the subject, as well as its arrangement for poetical composition, among us, the teacher would be deemed inexcusable. This opportunity occurs weekly; and, in the course of pas-

sing through the upper classes, the whole History, and most of the prophetical Writings, come at least once in review, and become objects of the labor, meditation, and reflection of every individual. But if this is thought a matter of course, what shall be said of our lesson in the highest class, where Grotius presents us with almost all the arguments that have been advanced in defence of our holy religion? I aver that it is now and always was, the most labored lesson of the week. If a boy were suffered, in this instance, to render the *words* only, then might we be said to neglect the *things* which belong unto Salvation: but it employs more time, and is enforced with more earnestness than any lesson in the week. The whole is read in the course of two years; and no individual, who completes his education, is sent into the world without having all the evidences of the Christian Religion set before him. This, my Lord, an indifferent person would call elementary instruction, at least; but Dr. Rennell, by an uniformity of perver-

collegiate Schools, which enjoin the participation of this bond of fellowship four times in every year, are in correspondence with the canons which bind the whole body of the Laity under the same obligation. The Laity have freed themselves from this injunction; the laws of toleration, and the manners of the times have taken all power out of the hands which ought to have enforced it, and religion is prejudiced by the change; but, as Ministers of the Gospel, it may be presumed, that we have no inclination to relax; and if we had the will, we have not the power to abrogate our statutes, or relieve those from the obligation whose attendance it is our duty to enforce.

What remains then, but to execute the trust reposed in us, to the advantage of those committed to our care; to instruct and inform them in regard to the nature of the institution, to prepare them to the utmost of our power? This is a duty, my Lord, most painfully and energetically performed; prayers are selected for the purpose; and, in addition to the other

duty in course, rather than proceeding from the voluntary inclination of the master; but it consists, my Lord, of a catechetical lecture, continued for four, five, or six days; it is executed with fidelity, and, I believe, with good effect. I have never seen an instance of that irreverent and tumultuous behaviour which occurs too frequently in the numerous assemblage from contiguous districts, but a sedate, temperate, and orderly attendance.

The last instance I shall produce, is a concern of such high importance, that I wish to speak of it with every caution that diffidence can suggest: It is the celebration of the Supper of the Lord; a momentous duty, when proposed to youth; and thought, by some, to be of too serious a nature to be undertaken by any of their early age, levity, and inexperience. But the opinion of the primitive Church, was in favor of early communion; our own office of confirmation, supposes all that have been confirmed to be ripe for this duty; and the statutes of the Universities and

collegiate Schools, which enjoin the participation of this bond of fellowship four times in every year, are in correspondence with the canons which bind the whole body of the Laity under the same obligation. The Laity have freed themselves from this injunction; the laws of toleration, and the manners of the times have taken all power out of the hands which ought to have enforced it, and religion is prejudiced by the change; but, as Ministers of the Gospel, it may be presumed, that we have no inclination to relax; and if we had the will, we have not the power to abrogate our statutes, or relieve those from the obligation whose attendance it is our duty to enforce.

What remains then, but to execute the trust reposed in us, to the advantage of those committed to our care; to instruct and inform them in regard to the nature of the institution, to prepare them to the utmost of our power? This is a duty, my Lord, most painfully and energetically performed; prayers are selected for the purpose; and, in addition to the other

offices of the day, performed, during the whole week previous, in the master's house; and upon one day in that week, a lecture, or rather affectionate address, is delivered to them, in a manner which I wish your Lordship or Dr. Rennell could attest. I have, with very little exception, personally, for thirty years, executed this office, four times in every year; and I have every reason to believe, that it is acceptable, salutary, and efficacious. I have received the thanks of several, after they have been many years removed from my tuition; and, I persuade myself, that I have laid in many, a foundation of virtue and religion, which will be built upon by those who have received the instruction, and be acknowledged by every one but my accusers. The first part of Christian education is to make young people acquainted with the Scriptures: the second is, to explain the doctrines, and apply the precepts; both, so far as I am a judge, are provided for in the course of instruction, which I have now detailed: the former part

by our statutes, the latter by the practice and attention of the instructors.

But here, my Lord, I expect to be told that all this may be done without effect; that the mere performance of this task is nothing, without the will, the mind, the example, the fervency, the zeal of the instructor. On this head I have nothing to offer for myself; but on this head I must observe, that neither Dr. Rennell or your Lordship are authorised to be my judges. To my own master I am to stand or fall, and whether my foundation is gold, wood, or stubble, must be determined before that tribunal, where I must plead no merit of my own, but appear with conscious trembling, for my imperfections, negligences, and omissions, and feel that there is but one hope of pardon for me and for you.

Or it will be said, that all this is without effect, because vice still exists. Doubtless it does, in schools as well as nations. Education can no more extinguish vice than law; but every good government, and every good insti-

tution of learning aim at the correction of the governed. And if you ask whether we perceive the immediate effect of our endeavours, I must answer with hesitation. For we cast our bread upon the waters, but we do not expect to find it till after many days. We experience no instantaneous conviction or conversion, nor do we hope it; and if we asserted it, it might be justly replied, that it is easy to make boys as well as men hypocrites, but very difficult to make them religious. As far as my own observation serves, it is the seed sown which is to ripen for the harvest, when the age of reflection shall arrive. Men, even young men, feel the want and consolation of religion; and it is when those thoughts present themselves, that memory will suggest the precepts and principles proposed to them in their youth. It is to that period we look forward for success; for though the majority among us is always on the side of virtue, I dare not say that the principles of religion are as evident now as we hope them to be hereafter.

you will be sorry for having reposed implicit confidence in Dr. Rennell; and it will be no pleasing sensation to reflect, that you have prejudiced the interests and estimation of a body of men whose life has been devoted to the service of their country. Our life is not an unhappy one: the attachment of the good, and their success in life compensates for the failure of those who have profited less by our endeavours; and if the performance of a laborious duty does not render it unhappy, why is it to be made so by unprovoked insult or unauthorised animadversion? Forty years' labor, and fifty years' experience, entitle me to a retirement of quiet and independence. But if my retirement is to be embittered with the reproach of having done no good, of systematic neglect, of resolute and contemptuous inattention to my duty—I answer, once for all, that "contemptuous neglect" is a term past comprehension; contempt of a duty towards God is not wickedness but insanity. And "resolute or systematic neglect," I disclaim, as a charge

But I cannot lay down my pen without calling upon your Lordship for a public revocation of your charge, so far as you impute systematic neglect to the conductors of Public Education; and if, with such revocation, you shall choose to insist upon the other articles of impeachment, I request your Lordship to make inquiry into the facts before you aggravate the injury. Those who have been bred at Westminster are to be met with in every circle; interrogate them on the subject—not generally, whether they have had a religious education, but particularly, whether the various duties here specified have been performed. Those only can satisfy your inquiries who have completed their education among us, and have enjoyed the benefit of the foundation: the information of others will be imperfect, extending only as far as their progress and situation in the school enabled them to see and judge. If, after such investigation, your Lordship shall find that you have injured a man who never gave you cause of offence, I think

you will be sorry for having reposed implicit confidence in Dr. Rennell; and it will be no pleasing sensation to reflect, that you have prejudiced the interests and estimation of a body of men whose life has been devoted to the service of their country. Our life is not an unhappy one: the attachment of the good, and their success in life compensates for the failure of those who have profited less by our endeavours; and if the performance of a laborious duty does not render it unhappy, why is it to be made so by unprovoked insult or unauthorised animadversion? Forty years' labor, and fifty years' experience, entitle me to a retirement of quiet and independence. But if my retirement is to be embittered with the reproach of having done no good, of systematic neglect, of resolute and contemptuous inattention to my duty—I answer, once for all, that "contemptuous neglect" is a term past comprehension; contempt of a duty towards God is not wickedness but insanity. And "resolute or systematic neglect," I disclaim, as a charge

utterly false and groundless; a falsehood I have proved it, if my testimony is worthy of credit; and if my assertion is not sufficient, I am ready to establish it by legal evidence, by oath, or any other ordeal that my accusers may demand. But for the present, I take my leave of them with the sentiment of a Poet and a Pagan:

> Εἰ δ' οὔδ' ἁμαρτάνουσι, μὴ πλείω κακὰ
> Πάθοιεν, ἢ καὶ δρῶσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ.

POSTSCRIPT.

For the information of those who are unacquainted with Westminster School, it is necessary to state, that the Sacred Exercises, mentioned above, were collected and drawn up by the late Mr. Wilcox, son of the Bishop of Rochester, a most pious and devout Christian, and one of the most elegant scholars of his time. They consist of Lessons with appropriate Col-

lects, and comprehend many of the moral and poetical passages from the Prophets, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Wisdom. They form only part of a general system intended to have been completed by an exemplification of Greek morality, from the memorabilia of Xenophon; and of Roman morality, in a work called Roman Conversations. The first and second part of this plan were executed, and are adopted. The Roman Conversations were finished by Mr. Wilcox, but not published till after his death, when they proved too voluminous for the purpose intended: but they are always recommended to the Scholars for perusal.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

In Westminster School.

In the three first forms, where children are estimated from 8 to 10 years of age—The Psalms and Gospels turned into Latin, are an exercise four days in the week.

On Monday Catechism repeated.

In the other forms of the Lower School—Sacred Exercises two days in a week.

On Mondays, alternately—Bishop Williams's Exposition, and the Catechism repeated and explained, *viva voce*.

Boys 10, 11, or 12 years of age.

Upper School.

Fourth Form.

Bible Exercise. Greek Testament. Sacred Exercises—and, at first, Greek Testament every day construed and explained.

Fifth Form, and Shell.

Nearly the same; with Sacred Exercises occasionally in all three.

Sixth Form.

Bible Exercise on Saturday.

Grotius Lesson on Monday, explained at large.

KING'S SCHOLARS.

Grotius, Hebrew Psalter, Bible Exercise weekly.

Upper Boys receive the Sacrament four times a-year; always lectured and prepared.

Throughout the Upper School,

Greek Testament during Passion Week—the history or doctrine explained.

Confirmation once in two years—a week's lecture to explain and prepare.

Prayers in College, and at the Boarding-houses.

On Saturdays in Term, Lectures are read to the King's Scholars by a Prebendary.

This Institution has produced two learned and useful publications by Dr. Heylin and Dr. Blair; and the duty is now very meritoriously performed by the Rev. Mr. Hughes, Prebendary.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION
At Winchester.

Prayers regularly morning and evening in Chapel.

Catechetical Lectures regularly read.

Upper Boys receive the Sacrament once a month.

Grotius read and explained every Sunday evening.

This account is very imperfect.

EPISTOLÆ M. T. CICERONIS, In Usum Schol. excerptæ. By the Same. Third Edition. 2s. bound.

The ELEMENTS of GREEK GRAMMAR; with Notes for the use of those, who have made some Progress in the Language. Fifth Edition. Price 6s. 6d. bds. By R. VALPY, D. D. F.A.S.

The ELEMENTS of LATIN GRAMMAR; with Notes for the use of those, who have made some Progress in the Language. Eleventh Edition. By the Same. Price 2s. 6d. bound.

DELECTUS SENTENTIARUM ET HISTORIARUM; ad usum Tironum accommodatus. Sixteenth Edition. Rendered easier by Explanations and Directions. By the Same. Price 2s. 6d. bound.

DELECTUS SENTENTIARUM GRÆCARUM; cum Notulis et Lexico. By the Same. Price 4s. bound. Third Edition.

FOUR PLAYS OF PLAUTUS: Amphitryo, Aulularia, Captives, and Rudens. With English Notes, and a Glossary. By the Same. Pr. 4s. 6d. bound.

A NEW LATIN VOCABULARY, Adapted to the best Latin Grammars; with Tables of Numerical Letters, Eng. and Lat. Abbreviations, and the value of Rom. and Gr. Coins. Fourth Ed. By the Same. 2s. bound.

FIRST EXERCISES; To be translated into Latin, with familiar Explanations. Fifth Edition. By the Same. 1s. 6d. bound.

LATIN DIALOGUES; Collected from the best Latin Writers. By the Same. Third Edition. 2s. 6d. bound.

PRINCIPIA OFFICIORUM, HISTORIÆ, ET GEOGRAPHIÆ; E Cicerone, Plinio Secundo, Justino, Cæsare, &c. excerpta. Second Ed. By the Same. 3s. 6d. bound.

POETICAL CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT AND ENGLISH HISTORY; With Historical and Explanatory Notes. Eighth Ed. By the Same. 2s. bound.

EPITOME SACRÆ HISTORIÆ, In Usum Scholarum. Third Ed. with English Notes. Pr. 2s. bound.

ELEMENTS of MYTHOLOGY; Or an easy and concise History of the Pagan Deities. Intended to enable the young Reader to understand the ancient Writers of Greece and Rome. Third Ed. 2s. bound.

CICERO DE OFFICIIS, with ENGLISH NOTES, Critical and Explanatory. The Text of the Heusingers is followed. For Students at College, and Schools. Pr. 6s. duod. boards.

"We congratulate the Editor of this treatise on the utility and execution of his design. To schools the present edition will prove particularly acceptable; considerable information and much useful elucidation will be found in the adscititious matter; and the student will be thus benefited without any unnecessary augmentation of labor. We consider this publication as a valuable addition to scholastic literature."—*Crit. Rev. Oct.* 1815.

CICERO DE AMICITIA ET DE SENECTUTE, from the Text of Ernesti, with all his Notes, and citations from his INDEX LATIN. CICERON. and much original matter, critical and explanatory. Second Edition. Pr. 6s. 6d. bound. By E. H. BARKER, Trin. Coll. Camb.

"It is indeed a publication which contains *multum in parvo;* and the classical student will find in it no small store of useful philological erudition."—*Crit. Rev.* v. 24. p. 330.

The GERMANY and AGRICOLA of TACITUS, from Brotier's Text, with all his Observations, Notes, and Emendations: and with Critical and Philological Remarks. Second Edition. By the Same. Pr. 5s. 6d. bound.

"This is a valuable addition to the number of our School Books. The Editor has given ample proofs of his various reading in his Notes at the end of the volume."—*Crit. Rev.* Nov. 1813.

PHÆDRI FABULÆ; from Burman's Text, with English Notes. The objectionable fables are omitted. Pr. 2s. 6d. bound. Second Edition. By the Rev. C. BRADLEY, M. A.

EUTROPIUS, with ENGLISH NOTES, on the plan of PHÆDRUS; and an Appendix, containing *Historical* and *Geographical Questions*. By the Same. 2s. 6d. bound.

OVIDII METAMORPHOSES SELECTÆ. With English Notes, and Geographical and Historical Questions. By the Same. Pr. 4s. 6d. bound.

It has been the design of the Editor to expunge from the above Editions every objectionable expression, and to add to a correctly printed text, Questions for the examination of the pupil, and short notes in English, explanatory of the Geography, Mythology, History, and Customs, of the Ancients. Similar editions will shortly be published of Sallust, Cornelius Nepos, Cæsar, and Cicero's Orations.

A SERIES of EXERCISES and QUESTIONS, adapted to the best Latin Grammars, and designed as a Guide to Parsing, and an Introduction to the Exercises of Valpy, Turner, Clarke, and Ellis, Whittaker's *Exempla Propria*, and the *Eton Exempla Minora*. By the Same. Second Edition. 2s. 6d. bound.

ELEMENTS of LATIN PROSODY, with Exercises and Questions, designed as an Introduction to the scanning and making Latin verses. Second Ed. 4s. bound. By the Same.

A KEY may be had by private application. Pr. 2s. 6d.

"The perusal of this book has afforded us much satisfaction; and we can confidently say, that, of its kind, it is of a very superior description. With the arrangement we are particularly pleased; the rules are developed with all possible perspicuity, and the examples are highly appropriate. We recommend these Exercises to the patronage of all persons engaged in classical education."—*Crit. Rev.* Aug. 1815.

CORNELII NEPOTIS Excellentium Imperatorum VITÆ; ad fidem exemplorum denuo castigatæ. Ed. 16ma. 3s. bound.

SERMONS on PUBLIC OCCASIONS. In 2 Vols. Pr. 18s. bds. By R. VALPY, D. D. F. A. S.

An ADDRESS from a CLERGYMAN to his PARISHIONERS. Fourth Edition. By the Same. Pr. 3s. 6d. bds. Contents:

Of God—the Son of God—the Holy Ghost—the Trinity—Read the Scriptures—Incarnation of Jesus Christ—Doctrines of Jesus Christ—Resurrection—Redemption—Justification—Faith—Works—Works without Faith—Faith without Works—Union of Faith and Works—Merit and Reward—Humility—Influence of the Holy Spirit—Repentance—Regeneration—Conversion—Delay of Conversion—our Endeavours—Predestination, Free-will—Prayer—Public Worship—Family Prayer—Sacrament—Forgiveness of Injuries—Veneration to the Name of God—Relative Duties—Exhortation to Piety—Prospect in Life—Use of Time—Death—Morning and Evening Prayer.

*** Gentlemen wishing to distribute copies of the above work to their poorer neighbours may have 50 copies at 2s. 6d. each, or 100 copies at 2s. 3d. each, by an application to the Printer.

The SUNDAY LECTURER; consisting of FIFTY SERMONS from Cooper, Jay, Horne, Doddridge, &c. adapted to the Use of SCHOOLS and FAMILIES, with Questions for Examination. Pr. 7s. duod. By Mrs. LEE.

A HISTORY of ALL RELIGIONS. A Particular Account of the Tenets of the Different Sects of the Apostolic Churches, with the Explanation of the Doctrines, Communion, and Order of Worship of the different Sects of Professing Christians at this Day, which, *for the sake of accuracy and precision, have been submitted to their inspection and approval.* By JOHN BELLAMY.

Second Edition. Pr. 6s. 6d. large paper 10s. 6d. With an engraving containing five heads.

SHAKSPEARE'S HIMSELF AGAIN; or the Language of the Poet asserted: being a full, but dispassionate Examen of the READINGS and INTERPRETATIONS of the later Editors; *besides an* EXPLANATION *of* ALL SUCH *passages as have been* PRONOUNCED INEXPLICABLE *by* OTHER EDITORS. The whole comprised in a series of Notes, SIXTEEN HUNDRED in number; and forming to the Various Editions of SHAKSPEARE, a *complete and necessary Supplement.* By ANDREW BECKET. 2 Vols. 8vo. Pr. 1l. bds.

A Review of the Present Condition of the Landed and Agricultural Interests. By R. Preston, Esq. M. P.

Bishop Watson on Equalization of Bishoprics, and Church Preferment.

Lord Sheffield on the Commercial Situation of Great Britain.

Considerations on the Rate of Interest, and on Redeemable Annuities. By E. B. Sugden, Esq.

Sir P. Francis's Letter Missive to Lord Grey.

Various Pamphlets on the Corn Laws.

Narrative of the Journey and Imprisonment of Pius VII. With a Plate.

History of Toussaint Louverture.

Judge Fletcher's celebrated Charge to the Grand Jury of Wexford.

The Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Grenville, Bishop Milner, Mr. C. Butler, Mr. Le Mesurier, and others, on the Catholic Question.

Sir S. Romilly, Mr. J. Stephen, and Mr. G. Hibbert, on the Slave Trade, and Reasons for Establishing a Registry of Slaves in the British Colonies.

American Encroachments on British Rights. By N. Atcheson, Esq.

A Brief Account of the Jesuits, with Historical Proofs in support of it, tending to establish the danger of the Revival of that Order to the world at large, and particularly to the United Kingdom.

An Inquiry into the Rise of Prices in Europe, during the last twenty-five years, compared with that which has taken place in England; with observations on High and Low Prices. By A. Young, Esq.

Mr. J. Benett's Prize Essay on Commutation of Tythes.

Sir J. Banks on Blight in Corn.

Mr. Clarkson and Dr. Richardson on the Poor Laws.

Mr. Taylor on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries.

Mr. F. P. Eliot on the Political and Financial Situation of Britain in 1816.

Mr. Rouse on the Comparative Value of Freehold and Copyhold.

Mr. Western's Speech on the Distressed State of Agriculture.

On Trial by Jury. By J. Longley, Esq.

Mr. T. Forster on the Use and Tendency of Dr. Gall's System of Craniology as appertaining to Education, &c.

Mr. Glover on the Property Tax.

Mr. Chitty on the Game Laws.

Sir Gilbert Blane on Scarcity of Provisions.

Besides the most Popular Pamphlets on other subjects of general interest.

The Classical Journal;

No. XXIX.

[Continued Quarterly,] containing a Variety of

CLASSICAL, BIBLICAL, AND ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

THE FOLLOWING SCARCE TRACTS

Are inserted in the Numbers already published.

A Complete Set of which may be had in 29 Nos. Price 8l. 14s.

Translation of Lycophron's Cassandra, with Notes; by Lord Royston.

A Chart of ten Numerals, in 200 Languages, with a Descriptive Essay. By the Rev. R. Patrick, Hull.

Bishop Pearson's minor Tracts, chronologically arranged.

An Introductory Essay on the Prepositions of the Greek Language; by James Moor, LL.D. Gr. Prof. in the Univ of Glasgow.

Account of Herculaneum; by the Rev. Mr. Hayter.

G. Canteri de ratione Emendandi Græcos Auctores Syntagma recens auctum.

Wasse On Latin Scholiasts.

Carmina Homerica, Ilias et Odyssea, a Rhapsodorum Interpolationibus repurgata, operâ et studio Ricardi Payne Knight.

*** This Edition, with many additions, is printed exclusively in the Class. Journ.—A copy of the 1st edition, of which only 50 were printed, was lately sold by auction for above 7l.

T. Falconer's Two Letters on the Oxford Strabo.

Fontes quos Tacitus in tradendis rebus ante se gestis videatur sequutus paucis indicat J. H. L. Meierotto. 1795.

Notarum Romanarum ac Literarum singularium compendiique scriptionis in antiquis codicibus et monumentis obvii Interpretatio, ex variis auctoribus collecta.

Oratio de Constitutione Tragœdiarum, et Sapientia civili atque Eloquentia ex earum Lectione haurienda.

Remarks on the Miscellaneous Observations on Authors, ancient and modern.

An Answer to a late Book written against Dr. Bentley, relative to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus.

Richardi Bentleii Oratiuncula.

Tentamen de Poetis Elegiacis; auctore J. Addisono.

An Inquiry into the Versification of Homer, and the Use of the Digamma in his Poems; by Professor Dunbar.

Twelve Plates of the Various Forms of the Greek Alphabet in different ages; with the Abbreviations and Connexions.

A Discourse on Ancient and Modern Learning; by the late Right Hon. Jos. Addison.

Richardi Bentleii Epistolæ Duæ ad Ti. Hemsterhusium.

D. Heinsii Oratio de Utilitate, quæ e lectione Tragœdiarum percipitur.

Bentleii Emendationes Ineditæ in Aristophanem; et Sil. Italicum.

Prof. Porson's Collation of the Harleian MS. of the Odyssey—also Collations of Cicero de Senectute—Perseus—Avienus—Suetonius—Sophocles—Eutropius.

Epist. Chr. G. Heyne, Gulielmo Vincent.

Bentleii Emendat. MSS. in Sophoclem, Theocritum, Bionem, Moschum, Nicandrum, et Callimachum.

On the Diversity of the Human Character; by Prof. Scott.

On some Idioms of the Greek Language; by W. Neilson.

Of the Greek and Latin Accents.

Of Degrees in the Universities; by Dr. Brett.

L. Bos "de Etymologia Græca."

Diatribe de Antimacho, Poeta et Grammatico Colophonio.

Sophronis Mimorum Fragmenta.

Ric. Porsoni Notæ in Aristophanem Brunckii.

On the Greek Sapphic Ode, by Rev. J. Tate.

The Origin of the Phæaces; by the Right Hon. Sir W. Drummond.

Hermogenis Progymnasmata.

Specimens of Modern Greek.

List of Romaic Authors, by Lord Byron.

Account of Manuscripts, Classical, Biblical, and Biblico-Oriental, with Dates, &c. in the Public Libraries in Britain.

Notes on Æschylus, by Professor Porson.

Two Latin Orations spoken at Oxford in the 17th Century.

Conjectura de Hesychio Milesio.

Concio ad Clerum, habita Cantibrigiæ. Auctore Rob. Sumner.

On the Greek Inscription on the Rosetta Stone, with a fac-simile.

On the Elean Inscription, with an Engraving; by R. P. Knight, Esq.

ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΓΛΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ, sive Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Auctore J. Juello.

Bentleii Emendat. MSS. in Sophoclem, Theocr. Bionem, Moschum, Nicandrum, et Callimachum.

Inscriptions: at Sens—at Axum—at Damietta—on a Helmet and Cauldron found in the Alpheus—on an Ionic Temple at Blenheim—on a Sarcophagus at Fenica—at Saguntum—at Eleusis—on a Monumental Urn—on some bricks found at Ancient Babel—on the Greek Theatre at Syracuse—at Beroot—at Barcelona—at Skripu—the Delian Inscription.

Cambridge Tripos Papers: for 1812—for 1808 and 1814—Glossary to Do. for 1814—for 1815—for 1781—for 1809.

Prologus ad Phormionem, apud ludos Westmonasterienses recitatus, 1809—Epilogus. Prologus ad Andriam, 1811—Epilogus. Prologus ad Eunuchum, 1812—Epilogus. Prologus ad Adelphos, 1813—Epilogus. Prologus ad Phormionem, 1814—Epilogus. Prologus ad Phormionem, 1815—Do. 1816.

Motives to the Study of Hebrew, by the Bishop of St. David's.

Essay on the Hebrew Points, and on the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, by Mr. Bellamy.—Answer to Do.

On the Ancient Language of Egypt, by Sir W. Drummond.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ ΠΕΠΛΟΣ, sive Aristotelis Epitaphia in Heroas Homericos; Fragmentum ab H. Stephano primum editum, nunc pluribus auctum Epitaphiis partim nuper editis, partim nunc primum e codice Harleiano.

Presentations and Congratulatory Odes, recited in the Theatre at Oxford, at the visit of the Prince Regent, the Emperor of Russia, &c. &c. in 1814.

Narrative of the last Illness and Death of Prof. Porson.

Life of Dr. Bentley.

Course of Studies pursued at Oxford.

Mathematicians and Medallists at Cambridge.

Defence of Public Schools.

Adversaria Literaria.

Lives of Dr. Vincent—Isaac Casaubon.

With many University Prize Essays and Poems.